DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 443 193 EA 030 524

AUTHOR	Kochan, Frances K., Ed.
TITLE	Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration 1999 Yearbook: Leadership for the 21st Century.
INSTITUTION	Auburn Univ., AL. Truman Pierce Inst. for the Advancement of Teacher Education.
PUB DATE	1999-11-00
NOTE	67p.; The Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration Yearbook is a refereed journal published under the auspices of the Council. The title of the 1999 Yearbook comes from the theme of the 1998 Annual Conference. Cover page varies from title page.
AVAILABLE FROM	Truman Pierce Institute, 2195 Haley Center, Auburn University, AL 36849-0558 ($10); Tel: 334-844-4488; Fax: 334-844-0558.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accountability; *Administrator Qualifications; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Leadership; *Leadership Training; Public Schools; School Culture; Standards; Supervisory Methods; *Supervisory Training; Technical Education

ABSTRACT

This collection of seven papers provides a view of the future of educational leadership. Some of the articles deal with the life and world of the principal, while others discuss the issues involved in training educators to become effective educational leaders. The first study examines methods and structures for preparing educators and deals with the way novice teachers are prepared. The article presents some challenging ideas about the impact of negative behaviors on the supervisory process, and details an instrument that might serve as a useful tool for school administrators and university professors. The second article focuses on the preparation of school leaders. The third deals with the professional-development needs of principals relative to the use of technology. The following study shares ideas for combining assessment with technology through the use of electronic portfolios. The remaining articles deal with joint decision making, providing a thoughtful look at what it is, why it does and does not work, and what we might do to assist principals in engaging in this process; the relationship of emotional intelligence to effectiveness in the principalship; and the holistic role of leadership. (DFR)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ERIC

ED 443 193

Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration 1999 Yearbook:

Leadership for the 21st Century

Edited by
Frances K. Kochan

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Kochan

2A TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Published By:

Truman Pierce Institute
College of Education
Auburn University
2195 Haley Center
Auburn University, AL 36854
November, 1999

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 030 534

Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration 1999 Yearbook:

Preparing Leaders Today for Tomorrow

Edited by
Frances K. Kochan

Published By:

Truman Pierce Institute
College of Education
Auburn University
2195 Haley Center
Auburn University, AL 36854
November, 1999

1998–1999
Executive Board

Chair
James Lyons
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Chair-Elect
Michael Richardson
Georgia Southern University

Secretary
D. "Annie" Henry
New Mexico Highlands University

Treasurer
Nancy Mims
West Georgia College

Historian
Ivan Bearden
Texas A&M – Kingsville

Committee Members
Ric Keaster, 1999
Southeastern Louisiana University

Tom Valesky, 2000
Florida Gulf Coast University

Rosalind Hale, 2001
Xavier University

Past Chair
Donn Gresso
East Tennessee State University

Retired Member
Robert Blackmon
Ona, Florida

The Southern Regional Council On Educational Administration Yearbook is a refereed journal published under the auspices of the Council. The title of the 1999 Yearbook, "Preparing Leaders Today for Tomorrow," comes from the theme of the 1998 Annual Conference. The Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration (SRCEA) is a non-profit, professional society that exists for the improvement of educational leadership preparation programs through the promotion of research and the exchange of ideas and information. Membership is open to all persons interested in the improvement of preparation programs for educational administrators. An annual meeting is held in the Fall, in varied locations in the South. Anyone interested in becoming a member of SRCEA and/or attending the annual meeting should contact:

Michael Richardson
Georgia Southern University
Department of Leadership, Technology and Human Development
P.O. Box 8131
Statesboro, GA 30460-8131
(912) 681-5078

Additional copies of the 1999 Yearbook may be purchased for $10.00 by writing to:

The Truman Pierce Institute
2195 Haley Center
Auburn University, AL. 36849-0558

or contacting

(334) 844-4488 (tel)
or
(334) 844-0558 (fax)

Southern Regional Council On Educational Administration
1999 Yearbook Editorial Assistance

EDITORIAL REVIEW BOARD

Lynn K. Bradshaw, *East Carolina University*
Patrick W. Carlton, *Virginia Tech.*
Jane K. Carrigan, *University of North Carolina, Charlotte*
Vicki M. Denmark, *Georgia State University*
J. W. Good, *Valdosta State University*
John S. Gooden, *University of North Carolina, Charlotte*
Jay Hertzog, *Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania*
Ernestine Holloway, *Jackson State University*
Judy Johnson, *Murray State University*
Ric Keaster, *University of Mississippi*
James O. McDowelle, *East Carolina University*
Russell O. Mays, *East Tennessee State University*
David J. Parks, *Virginia Tech.*
Harbison Pool, *Georgia Southern University*
Barbara S. Smith, *Radford University*
Donald R. Tetreault, *University of South Carolina*

MANUSCRIPT REVIEWERS

Lynn K. Bradshaw, *East Carolina University*
Jane K. Carrigan, *University of North Carolina, Charlotte*
Vicki M. Denmark, *Georgia State University*
Emmet M. Floyd, *East Carolina University*
J. W. Good, *Valdosta State University*
Roslin Growe, *University of Southwestern Louisiana*
Jay Hertzog, *Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania*
Ernestine Holloway, *Jackson State University*
Judy Johnson, *Murray State University*
Ric Keaster, *University of Mississippi*
James O. McDowelle, *East Carolina University*
Russell O. Mays, *East Tennessee State University*
David J. Parks, *Virginia Tech.*
Harbison Pool, *Georgia Southern University*
Barbara S. Smith, *Radford University*
Donald R. Tetreault, *University of South Carolina*

TECHNICAL ADVISORS

Jennifer Riley
Jan Szechi
Altamese Stroud-Hill
Shari Campbell

Author Notes

Diane Boothe is a former principal from California. She is an associate professor in the Department of Secondary and Middle Grades at the State University of Georgia. She supervises student teachers as part of her duties.

Cletus R. (Clete) Bulach is a former school superintendent from Ohio. He is currently an associate professor in the Department of Educational Leadership and Professional Studies at the State University of Georgia. He specializes in the development of supervisory skills for future administrators.

Jackson L. Flanigan is Professor of Educational Leadership and Chair of the Department of Counseling and Educational Leadership at Clemson University. Dr. Flanigan served for many years as a high school principal and superintendent in West Virginia before entering the professoriate. He is a respected scholar having published seven books and more than sixty articles. Dr. Flanigan earned the doctorate from Virginia Tech.

Warren C. Hope is an Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership and Human Services at Florida A&M University in Tallahassee, Florida. He is the Coordinator of the Masters and Modified Degree Program. Dr. Hope has been a middle grades teacher, assistant principal and principal at the elementary level. His research and teaching interests include middle grades, educational technology, and the principalship.

Johnetta Hudson is an associate professor at the University of North Texas in Denton. She was formerly the West Distinguished Professor at Midwestern State University. She teaches Masters and Doctoral level courses in educational leadership. Dr. Hudson has published several articles and book chapters that focus on race, class and gender issues in educational leadership. Another focus of her teaching, writing, and presentations is the integration of technology into leadership development.

Martha B. Hudson teaches in the Department of Educational Leadership and Cultural Foundations at UNC-Greensboro. She brings experience as a school leader to her work with UNC-G's principal preparation program. Her research interests include principal preparation, assessment, and school improvement. In addition to her work at UNC-G, Martha works with schools across the state on developing school-based capacity for improvement.

Cathy S. Jording is Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership at Georgia Southern University. Dr. Jording was an elementary principal in Kentucky during KERA reform, and served briefly in the Kentucky State Department of Education. She has co-authored a book and several journal articles. Dr. Jording was awarded the doctorate from the University of Kentucky.

Frances K. Kochan is the director of the Truman Pierce Institute and an Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology at Auburn University. Her research interests include the creation of collaborative relationships and organizations, the roles and beliefs of educational practitioners, the creation and evaluation of professional development schools, and the restructuring of schools and institutions of higher education.

Kenneth E. Lane is Professor of Educational Leadership at California State University–San Bernardino where he has served in numerous capacities from program coordinator to Assistant Dean of the College of Education. Dr. Lane is a prolific scholar with eight books and more than seventy articles published to date. Dr. Lane was an assistant prinicipal and principal prior to earning the doctorate from Texas A & M-Commerce.

James McDowelle is Chair and Associate Professor of the Department of Educational Leadership at East Carolina State University. He has served as a teacher, principal, and superintendent in the public schools. His research interests included the role of emotion in educational leadership, ethical leadership behavior, charter schools, and the superintendency.

Carol A. Mullen is an assistant professor in Educational Foundations, Leadership, and Technology at Auburn University, Alabama. Her research and teaching focus on leadership preparation, collaborative mentoring practices, and organizational development and change. She has published four books, one of which received the 1998 Exemplary Research in Teacher Education Award from the American Educational Research Association (Division K), numerous academic articles and, in the role of guest editor, many special issues of journals.

Winston Pickett is a former superintendent from Tennessee who was an associate professor in the Department of Secondary and Middle Grades at the State University of Georgia. He supervised student teachers as part of his duties. Currently he is a professor at Tennessee Tech.

Michael D. Richardson is Professor of Educational Leadership and Doctoral Program Coordinator at Georgia Southern University. Dr. Richardson was awarded the EdD from the University of Tennessee. He has authored or edited twelve books and published more than eighty articles in professional journals. Dr. Richardson served as a secondary and elementary principal, Personnel Director, and Assistant Superintendent before entering university teaching.

Robert G. Stakenas received his Ph.D. from the University of Michigan. When he retired after 32 years of service at Florida State University, his colleagues in the Department of Educational Leadership awarded him the title of Professor Emeritus. He continues to use his computer technology skills to analyze data for decision making at Carter–Parramore Middle School in Quincy, Florida. He also uses the computer for design and production of digital photographs.

Dennis W. Van Berkum is Associate Professor of Educational Leadership and Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership at Moorhead State University in Minnesota. Dr. Van Berkum was a public school administrator for many years prior to obtaining the doctorate from the University of South Dakota.

Ronald D. Williamson teaches in the Department of Educational Leadership and Cultural Foundations at Univerity of North Carolina–Greensboro. He brings experience as a school and district-level leader to his work with UNC–G's principal preparation program. Research interests include principal preparation, school culture, and middle schools. In addition to his work at UNC-G, Ron works with schools across the country on improving leadership and student achievement.

Looking Through the Window Into Tomorrow: Leadership in the 21st Century

Frances K. Kochan
Auburn University

Leadership is an elusive term which has been defined and redefined throughout history. Definitions of leadership are related to cultural context, and therefore change as the society within a culture changes. Within our own culture, our definitions of leadership are diverse and constantly changing, including models ranging from scientific (Fayol, 1949) to transformational (Foster, 1989). Most studies of educational leadership have concluded that leadership has two dimensions, personal and organizational (Getzels & Guba, 1957; Hershey & Blanchard, 1982; Hoy & Miskel, 1991), and that leaders differ in their focus upon these two aspects as they lead and manage. The role of the educational leader has become more diverse and multi-dimensional, increasing both the demands made upon the leader (Kochan, In Press) and the skills needed to be successful (Kochan & Spencer, 1999). As we look toward the 21st century, the focus is on collaborative leadership, which includes joint decision-making, team and community building (Oxley, 1997; Sergiovanni, 1994), systems thinking (Senge, 1990), and centering the focus on teaching and learning (NPBEA, 1996). Through the articles contained within this Yearbook, our authors provide us with a view of the future of educational leadership. Some of the articles deal with the life and world of the principal, while others discuss the issues involved in training educators to become effective educational leaders. Reading their perspectives is much like looking through a window and seeing the future poised before us. Rowland (1982) suggested that part of the magic of windows is that they are "in-between places where the inside and outside worlds come together" (p. xiii). So, too, our authors take us to the "in-between space" between the 20th and the 21st centuries.

We will look through the "window" in three directions. The first leads us to an examination of our methods and structures for preparing educators. Bulach, Boothe and Pickett deal with the way in which we prepare novice teachers. They present some challenging ideas about the impact of negative behaviors on the supervisory process, and share an instrument that might serve as a useful tool for school administrators and university professors alike. This article reminds us that no matter what the century, the human factor and the need to support all of our colleagues, particularly those new to the profession, will always be of vital importance.

Hudson and Williamson focus on the preparation of school leaders. They discuss the use of standards of performance and measurement techniques that go beyond the knowledge level of performance to determine an individual's leadership capabilities. The article presents some interesting notions for redesigning the programs that prepare these leaders. Such restructuring will be a requirement for all those who seek to assure that individuals leaving our programs today will be prepared to lead the schools of tomorrow.

The second vista from our imaginary window leads us to focus on technology and its application to the principalship. Hope and Stakenas deal with the professional development needs of principals related to the use of technology. They emphasize the needs of this group, who are often forgotten in staff development activities at the district level. Their words remind us that the leader of tomorrow must have a broad base of skills and will be expected to lead in a variety of dimensions.

Johnetta Hudson takes us to the halls of academia and shares ideas for combining assessment with technology through the use of electronic portfolios. Her enthusiastic article emphasizes the "learn by doing" model we so often recommend for N–12 students but tend to neglect when working at the college level. She takes us into the university classroom setting, providing us with some specific methods we can adopt or adapt in our own classrooms.

Our final look out of the window leads us to a wide expanse, looking farther into the distance at the principalship of the future. Richardson, Jording, Lane, Flanigan, and Van Berkum discuss the issue of joint decision-making, providing a thoughtful look at what it is, why it does and does not work, and what we might do to assist principals in engaging in this process. Like most changes, it appears that it is easier to write about and think about democratic leadership than it is to engage in it on a day-to-day basis. They provide much that can be used in discussions with those preparing to be leaders and in designing a curriculum to meet their needs.

McDowelle's article presents us with a fascinating perspective as he deals with the relationship of emotional intelligence to effectiveness in the principalship. His article takes us beyond the present to contemplate a whole new set of issues related to the selection, education, and assessment of school leaders. In some ways this article harks back to the first article in our Yearbook (Bulach et al.) with its focus upon the human interactions which can hinder our personal development.

The final article, by Mullen, offers a provocative perspective on leadership for the future, causing us to strain our eyes and expand our minds to think more holistically about this role. It is an apt ending to our Yearbook, taking us from the "in-between" space to the space "beyond."

I believe this edition of the *SRCEA Yearbook* offers a perfect blend of the practical and the theoretical as we embark on the 21st Century. It has been my pleasure to serve as the editor. I wish to thank the authors, the reviewers, and the SRCEA Board for their help and support. I am honored to be a part of this exciting endeavor.

References

Fayol, H. (1949). *General and industrial administration.* New York: Pittman.

Foster, W. (1989, March). *School leaders as tranformational intellectuals: A theoretical argument.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Getzels, J.W. & Guba, E.G. (1957). Social behavior and the administrative process. *The School Review, 65,* 423–441.

Hershey, P. & Blanchard, K. (1982). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1991). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill

Kochan, F. K. (In Press). A collage of voice and form: A summary of the findings. In F. K. Kochan, B. Jackson, & D. Duke, (Eds.) *A thousand voices from the firing line: A study of educational leaders, their jobs, their preparation, and the problems they face.* Columbia, MO: UCEA Press.

Kochan, F. K., & Spencer, W. (1999). The Principalship: The Practitioner's Perspective. *Mid-South Educational Research Journal,6*(1) 9–16.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA). (1996). *NCATE curriculum guidelines for advanced programs in educational leadership. A publication of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration.* VA: Author.

Oxley, D. (1997). Theory and practice of school communities. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 33* (supplement), 624–643.

Rowland, A.Z. (1982). *Handcrafted doors and windows.* Emmaus, PA: Rodale Press.

Senge, P.M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization.* New York: Currency/Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T. (1994). *Building community in schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Behaviors That Adversely Affect the Supervisory Climate of Student Teachers

Clete Bulach
State University of West Georgia

Diane Boothe
State University of West Georgia

Winston Pickett
Tennessee Tech

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the extent to which behaviors that could adversely affect the supervisory climate for student teachers were exhibited by college supervisors and supervising teachers. The research revealed that college professors used fewer negative behaviors than supervising teachers. Findings of this research and use of this instrument may enable college professors and principals to decide which student teachers are in poor supervisory climates and may require further observations, and help provide a more positive student teaching experience. Such actions may result in more effective teachers and better future leaders for our schools.

Introduction

If we are to "prepare leaders today for tomorrow," the place to start is with student teachers. If student teachers have a positive teaching experience, they are more likely to become successful teachers and leaders in their classrooms. The supervisory climate that develops between student teachers and their supervisors in both the university and classroom can significantly affect their ability to become effective teachers and future leaders of our schools. One of the factors which determines whether this climate is positive or negative is the behavior of the supervising teacher and college supervisor as they interact with the student teacher. The literature is replete with information about the types of behaviors and skills supervisors should utilize in their interactions with subordinates, and many organizations have already developed lists of essential skills educational leaders should possess. In addition to state, university, and national organizations, there is a plethora of writers/scholars who have their own ideas concerning what educational leaders should be able to do and the type of training they should have (Bulach & Pickett, 1995; Hallinger & McCary, 1992; Hallinger, Leithwood, & Murphy, 1993; Hoyle, 1991; Lumsden, 1993).

The focus in much of the literature, however, is on what educational leaders *should* do, rather than on what they should *not* do. According to Davis (1998), those behaviors that cause most supervisors' problems with their subordinates are in the area of human relations. The relationship that is established between a supervisor and their subordinate is highly dependent on human relations, and an awareness of the types of behavior that can cause good human relations to deteriorate is important. We believe that the use of negative types of behavior by a supervisor will have a greater effect on the supervisory climate than the use of positive behavior, and that the effect of a negative behavior is far greater than the effect of a number of positive behaviors (Bulach, Boothe, & Pickett, 1998).

A positive supervisory climate has the potential to improve the effectiveness of student teachers and promote student learning. According to Pipho (1998) "the single largest factor affecting academic growth of student populations is differences in effectiveness of individual classroom teachers" (p.341). The student teaching experience is a major influence on the professional development of student teachers, and Richardson (1998) and Sparks (1998) both stress the importance of professional development for teachers as a way to improve student learning. Consequently, there is a need to create an environment or supervi-

sory climate that will increase the likelihood that the student teaching experience will help the novice to become an effective teacher and future leader.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the extent to which the types of negative behavior that could adversely affect the supervisory climate for student teachers were exhibited by college supervisors and supervising teachers. While most college supervisors and supervising teachers believe that their use of negative behaviors is infrequent, there is little data on which to base these beliefs. Using the research of Bulach et al. (1998), the negative behaviors used most frequently by supervisors in interacting with their subordinates were grouped according to the following climate variables: human relations, communications, vision/knowledge, conflict management, administrative ability, and decisiveness/judgment. Based on this research, the nine hypotheses listed in the "Results" section were tested. For the purposes of this study, "supervisory climate" was considered to be the psychological environment that exists between a supervisor and a student teacher as a result of the supervisors' use or disuse of negative behaviors in their interactions with the student teacher. Negative behaviors were defined as those behaviors supervisors should try to avoid as they carry out their leadership responsibilities (Bulach et al., 1998).

Methodology

The independent variable for this causal comparative design was the type of supervision. The dependent variables included the overall supervisory climate, as well as the six variables used to measure it. The data were collected over a two year period with two different sets of student teachers.

Subjects

Twenty-one student teachers were involved in the study in 1996–97, and 22 were involved in 1997–98. The college supervisors were the same for both years. One was a male professor and one was a female professor. Both had at least three years of experience supervising student teachers.

Instrumentation

The instrument (see Appendix A) was developed based on the research of Bulach et al. (1998). The negative behaviors identified as mistakes which could be made by supervisors were incorporated in a survey entitled "A Survey of the Leadership Behaviors of College Supervisors and Supervising Teachers." The survey has 53 items, the first four of which were used to collect demographic data. Students responded using a five-point scale, with "never" scored as 1.0 and "always" as 5.0. The variable "human relations" is measured by nine items, "communications" is measured by seven items, "vision/knowledge" is measured by nine items, "conflict management" is measured by seven items, "administrative ability" is measured by eleven items, and "decisiveness/judgment" is measured by six items. The reliability and internal consistency were tested using the Cronbach alpha. A correlation coefficient of 0.96 indicates that the instrument has excellent reliability.

Procedures

Before going to their student teaching assignments, student teachers were required to purchase a Student Teaching *Handbook* and attend an informational session regarding expectations and procedures. They also received inservice training on school law, classroom climate, organizational skills, and various teaching methods throughout their college coursework. Classroom supervising teachers also received Student Teaching *Handbooks* and met with college supervisors to review expectations before the arrival of student teachers.

The data were collected during a second meeting with all the student teachers (N = 43) two months into their classroom placement. They were given one answer sheet and instructed to complete it based on their experience with the classroom supervising teacher. Once these were collected, a second answer sheet was distributed and they were instructed to respond to the same set of questions regarding their college supervising teacher. Due to time constraints, some student teachers left the meeting and did not complete the survey on college supervisors' behaviors (N = 29).

Method of Analysis

The first 8 hypotheses were tested using the t-test for independent groups. The last hypothesis was tested using the Pearson product-moment correlation.

Results

Hypothesis #1: The frequency with which college supervisors and supervising teachers use negative behaviors would be minimal.

The average score for the leadership behaviors associated with mistakes supervisors can make ranged from a low of 1.17 to a high of 1.66 for the college professors. The same score for each supervising teacher ranged from a low of 1.33 to a high of 2.35. Scores close to 1.0 mean that a supervisor "never" exhibits that behavior, while scores close to 2.0 mean the supervisor "seldom" exhibits that behavior. College supervisors had no scores that averaged 2.0 or higher, and only three supervising teachers had average scores that were 2.0 or higher. Since there were no scores that approached 3.0 or higher, which would have indicated that supervisors "sometimes" exhibited those behaviors, hypothesis #1 was accepted..

Hypothesis #2: There would be no significant difference in the behaviors associated with negative behaviors for college supervisors and supervising teachers.

A t-test comparison of the average score for each college supervisor and supervising teacher for all behaviors measured by the survey yielded a t-score of 8.4, which was significant at the .0001 level, as shown in Table 1. Supervising teachers were found to practice a higher frequency of negative behaviors, and consequently, hypothesis #2 was rejected.

Hypothesis #3: There would be no significant difference in the behaviors associated with human relations for college supervisors and supervising teachers.

"Human relations" was considered to include those behaviors associated with a supervisor's ability to meet the human or people needs of the student teacher being supervised, and was covered in questions 5 through 13 of the survey. A t-test comparison of college supervisors' and supervising teachers' scores for behaviors associated with human relation skills yielded a t-score of 0.4, which was not significant at the .05 level (Table 2). Consequently, hypothesis #3 was accepted.

Hypothesis #4: There would be no significant difference in the behaviors associated with communications for college supervisors and supervising teachers.

"Communications" was considered to refer to those behaviors that are involved in giving and receiving information, questions 14 through 20 of the survey. A t-test comparison of college supervisors' and supervising teachers' scores for behaviors associated with communication skills yielded a t-score of 1.4, which was not significant at the .05 level (Table 3). Consequently, hypothesis #4 was accepted.

Hypothesis #5: There would be no significant difference in the behaviors associated with vision and knowledge for college supervisors and supervising teachers.

"Vision and knowledge" was considered to refer to those behaviors that affect instruction in some way, questions 21 through 29 of the survey. A t-test comparison of college supervisors' and supervising

Table 1

A Comparison of College Supervisors' and Supervising Teachers' Behaviors Associated with Mistakes (average score per item)

	M	SD	N	t-score	p
Supervising Teachers	1.61	0.20	43	8.40	0.0001
College Supervisors	1.33	0.12	29		

$p < 0.05$

Table 2
A Comparison of College Supervisors' and Supervising Teachers' Behaviors Associated with Human Relation Skills (aggregate score for 9 items)

	M	SD	N	t-score	p
Supervising Teachers	14.09	6.2	43	0.43	0.68
College Supervisors	13.48	5.8	29		

$p > 0.05$

Table 3
A Comparison of College Supervisors' and Supervising Teachers' Behaviors Associated with Communication Skills (aggregate score for 7 items)

	M	SD	N	t-score	p
Supervising Teachers	11.14	5.8	43	1.38	0.17
College Supervisors	9.45	3.6	29		

$p > 0.05$

teachers' scores for behaviors associated with vision and knowledge yielded a t-score of 2.0, which was significant at the .05 level (Table 4). The vision and knowledge scores of college supervisors indicate that they make fewer mistakes in this category of behaviors, and, consequently, hypothesis #5 was rejected.

Hypothesis #6: There would be no significant difference in the behaviors associated with conflict management for college supervisors and supervising teachers.

"Conflict management" was considered to refer to those behaviors that are used to avoid conflict, questions 30 through 36 of the survey. A t-test comparison of college supervisors' and supervising teachers' scores for behaviors associated with conflict management skills yielded a t-score of 1.9, which was not significant at the .05 level (Table 5). Consequently, hypothesis #6 was accepted.

Hypothesis #7: There would be no significant difference in the behaviors associated with administrative ability for college supervisors and supervising teachers.

"Administrative ability" was considered to refer to those behaviors used to manage the behavior of subordinates, questions 37 through 47 of the survey. A t-test comparison of college supervisors' and supervising teachers' scores for behaviors associated with administrative skills yielded a t-score of 1.7, which was not significant at the .05 level (Table 6). Consequently, hypothesis #7 was accepted.

Hypothesis #8: There would be no significant difference in the behaviors associated with decisiveness and judgment for college supervisors and supervising teachers.

"Decisiveness and judgment" was considered to refer to those behaviors used when action on something is taken, questions 48 through 53 of the survey. A t-test comparison of college supervisors' and supervising teachers' scores for behaviors associated with decisiveness and judgment skills yielded a t-score of 1.2, which was not significant at the .05 level (Table 7). Consequently, hypothesis #8 was accepted.

Hypothesis # 9: There would be a significant positive relationship between the variables measured by the survey.

Table 4
A Comparison of College Supervisors' and Supervising Teachers' Behaviors Associated with Vision and Knowledge (aggregate score for 9 items)

	M	SD	N	t-score	p
Supervising Teachers	14.55	7.6	43	2.00	0.05
College Supervisors	11.45	4.3	29		

$p < 0.05$

Table 5
A Comparison of College Supervisors' and Supervising Teachers' Behaviors Associated with Conflict Management (aggregate score for 7 items)

	M	SD	N	t-score	p
Supervising Teachers	11.69	6.3	43	1.94	0.06
College Supervisors	9.17	3.5	29		

$p > 0.05$

Table 6
A Comparison of College Supervisors' and Supervising Teachers' Behaviors Associated with Administrative Skills (aggregate score for 11 items)

	M	SD	N	t-score	p
Supervising Teachers	17.32	9.8	43	1.70	0.092
College Supervisors	13.83	5.6	29		

$p > 0.05$

Table 7
A Comparison of College Supervisors' and Supervising Teachers' Behaviors Associated with Decisiveness and Judgment (aggregate score for 6 items)

	M	SD	N	t-score	p
Supervising Teachers	8.92	4.1	43	1.23	0.22
College Supervisors	7.69	3.4	29		

$p > 0.05$

Table 8
The Relationships between the Variables Measured by the Survey

	Communication Skills	Vision & Knowledge	Conflict Management	Administrative Ability	Decisiveness & Judgment
Human Relations	0.88	0.64	0.61	0.80	0.79
Communication Skills		0.81	0.67	0.87	0.83
Vision & Knowledge			0.79	0.88	0.73
Conflict Management				0.77	0.71
Administrative Ability					0.83

$p < 0.001$

The relationships between the variables were analyzed using the Pearson product moment correlations. Significant positive relations ($p < .001$) were found between all the variables measured by the survey (Table 8), and hypothesis # 9 was accepted.

Discussion

As expected, the frequency with which college supervisors and supervising teachers use negative behaviors was minimal. Individual item analysis, however, was quite revealing in some instances. For example, one student viewed the college supervisor's overall behavior positively, but responded with an "always" on the behavior "uses reward and coercion to motivate me" and "tells me to make due [sic] with what I have." Another student, who also viewed the supervising teacher's behavior positively, responded with an "always" on the behavior "has not supported me when parents were involved" and "corrects me in front of others instead of privately." While the overall behaviors were positive, 28 of the 43 students responded "always" or "often" to one or more of the 49 negative behaviors. In addition, five of the 43 students were found to be working in a supervisory climate that was not positive because they responded that negative behaviors were used more than 50% of the time. One student responded "always" or "often" on 44 of the 49 negative behaviors. While the aggregate data shows a very positive supervisory climate, individual data and data on individual items appear to identify a number of areas in which supervisory behaviors could be considered negative and in need of improvement.

The researchers were surprised and perplexed by the finding that supervisory teachers displayed more negative behaviors than college supervisors. At the time the survey was administered, the student teachers and supervising teachers had been working together for only two months, while the college supervisors and student teachers had been together since the start of the school year, for a total of seven months. Thus, a partial explanation for this finding may be that the college supervisors and student teachers had been interacting for a greater length of time, which could have given them more time to develop a better relationship and a more positive supervisory climate.

While there were no differences in the supervisory behaviors of college supervisors and supervising teachers associated with human relations and communications skills, responses to some of the individual comments indicate there may have been some subtle differences here. The items "[m]y supervisor does not

compliment me" and "does not delegate responsibilities" were the two human relations behaviors receiving the most negative scores. Examples of poor communications behavior included: "[m]y supervisor does not model good communication skills" and "gossips about other teachers and administrators." Nineteen of the 43 student teachers responded affirmatively to these two behaviors. However, 24 student teachers responded that their supervising teacher "never" or "seldom" used these behaviors.

The finding that there is a difference in behaviors associated with vision and knowledge between the supervising teachers and the college supervisor was not surprising. Since college supervisors have doctorate degrees in pedagogy and have been training and preparing the student teachers to enter the teaching profession, their vision and knowledge base would be expected to be at a different level than that of the supervising teacher. This is not to say that the supervising teachers were not viewed as having strengths in these areas. Their score of 14.5 for the nine behaviors on this variable indicates that the average response was that they "always or often" showed that they had a high level of vision and knowledge.

The aggregate data for "conflict management," "administrative ability," and "decisiveness and judgment" showed no significant differences in the use of negative behaviors. Individual data and individual items in response to the behavior of supervising teachers, however, revealed some behaviors that are worth further investigation. For example, the most frequently reported negative behavior in the "conflict management" variable was "[m]y supervising teacher shrugs off problems or concerns." The most frequently reported negative behavior in the "administrative skills" area was "[m]y supervising teacher fails to involve me in decisions." Under "decisiveness/judgment," the most frequently reported negative behavior was "[m]y supervising teacher makes snap judgments."

The significant positive relationships in all the variables associated with supervisory climate indicate that a positive change in any one variable is likely to result in a positive change in the other variables. Since most of the negative behaviors are not used, this makes the individual item analysis very important. When college supervisors and principals work with supervising teachers and student teachers to improve the supervisory climate, they need to address those behaviors that are negatively influencing the supervisory climate. By addressing these problem areas, improvements in all areas are likely to occur, producing student teachers who can become more effective teachers and leaders in their classrooms and creating a pool of future school leaders.

Uses of the Survey

The instrument used in this study, "A Survey of the Leadership Behaviors of Supervisors," may be used as a tool to facilitate the placement of student teachers. Administered at a point part-way through the student teaching process, it could serve as a means of identifying student teachers who are misplaced or are experiencing difficulties in relating to their college supervisor or supervising teacher. If a negative supervisory climate is discovered, a decision could then be made to change the placement or address the negative behaviors identified by the survey instrument. If the decision to work with a supervising teacher is made, confidentiality must be considered. The validity of the data would be jeopardized if the student knew that it was going to be shared with the supervising teacher. Consequently, any decision to share the data and work with the supervising teacher should be done only with the consent of the student teacher. Without the student teacher's consent, the college supervisor or principal would have to work as a facilitator with the supervising teacher to address the problem behaviors without revealing that the information came from the student teacher.

Principals are frequently not aware of the day-to-day experiences of the student teachers in their schools. This instrument would give them a convenient tool to monitor the effectiveness of the supervisory climate for student teachers, and might assist them in addressing overall areas of strength and weakness within the school site.

Conclusions

In this study, five of the 43 student teacher placements had a poor supervisory climate which needed investigation and assistance. While the frequency of negative supervisory behaviors toward student teachers was minimal for both college supervisors and classroom supervising teachers, careful monitoring of the supervisory climate is still advised. The supervisory climate between student teachers and college and classroom supervisors is a key factor in a preservice teacher's ability to become an effective teacher and leader. If we want better future leaders for our schools, who know how to create positive supervisory environments for their teachers, the place to start is by providing positive supervisory environments for them when they are student teachers. We hope this study provides a meaningful approach to creating such environments.

References

Bulach, C. R., & Pickett, W. (1995). Trade secrets. *The Executive Educator, 17*(2), 20–21.

Bulach, C. R., Boothe, D., & Pickett, W. (1998). "Should nots" for school principals: Teachers share their views. *ERS Spectrum: Journal of School Research and Information, 16*(1), 16–20.

Davis, S. H. (1998). Superintendents' perspectives on the involuntary departure of public school principals: The most frequent reasons why principals lose their jobs. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 34*(1), 58–90.

Hallinger, P., Leithwood, K., & Murphy, J. (1993). *Cognitive perspectives on educational leadership.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Hallinger, P., & McCary, C. E. (1992). *Developing the strategic thinking of instructional leaders.* Cambridge, MA: The National Center for Educational Leadership.

Hoyle, J.R. (1991). The principal and the pear tree. *Journal of School Leadership, 1*(2), 106–118.

Lumsden, L. (1993). The new face of principal preparation. *Research Roundup, 9*(2), 2–3.

Pipho, C. (1998). The value-added side of standards. *Phi Delta Kappa, 79*(5), 341.

Richardson, J. (1998, April). California study links student learning to teacher learning. *RESULTS* (A publication of the National Staff Development Council), 1, 6.

Sparks, D. (April, 1998). Teacher expertise linked to student learning. *RESULTS* (A publication of the National Staff Development Council), 2.

Appendix A:
A SURVEY OF THE LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS OF SUPERVISORS

Part I – Demographics

Directions: Respond to each item by filling in the blank on the computer scan sheet which most accurately describes you.

1. **Location of Position.**
   A. elementary school
   B. middle school
   C. high school
   D. vocational/technical
   E. other

2. **Level of Preparation**
   A. Bachelor's Degree
   B. Master's Degree
   C. Specialist's Degree
   D. Doctorate Degree
   E. Other

3. **Total Years of Teaching Experience**
   A. 0–5
   B. 6–10
   C. 11–15
   D. 16–20
   E. 21+

4. **Gender**
   A. female
   B. male

Part II — Survey Items

Directions: Use the scale below to respond to each item by filling in the blank on the computer scan sheet for the response which comes closest to **describing how often you see your supervisor exhibit this behavior.**

A	B	C	D	E
NEVER	SELDOM	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	ALWAYS

5. My supervisor displays a lack of trust.
6. My supervisor demonstrates an uncaring attitude.
7. My supervisor fails to provide positive reinforcement.
8. My supervisor fails to interact with staff.
9. My supervisor remains distant.

10. My supervisor does not call me by name.
11. My supervisor does not delegate responsibilities.
12. My supervisor does not compliment me.
13. My supervisor uses reward and coercion to motivate me.
14. My supervisor does not listen.
15. My supervisor fails to use eye contact.
16. My supervisor fails to provide feedback regarding my teaching.
17. My supervisor corrects me in front of others instead of privately.
18. My supervisor does not model good communication skills.
19. My supervisor is not able to keep a confidence.
20. My supervisor gossips about other teachers or administrators.
21. My supervisor shows favoritism to some teachers.
22. My supervisor has double standards.
23. My supervisor has not supported me when parents were involved.
24. My supervisor demonstrates a lack of vision.
25. My supervisor is not knowledgeable about the curriculum.
26. My supervisor is not knowledgeable about instructional strategies.
27. My supervisor is partial to influential parents.
28. My supervisor does not support me even if I am wrong.
29. My supervisor is afraid to question his/her superiors.
30. My supervisor shrugs off or devalues a problem or concern.
31. My supervisor "passes the buck" rather than dealing with a situation.
32. My supervisor does not remember what it is like to be a teacher.
33. My supervisor frequently interrupts my teaching.
34. My supervisor assigns too much paperwork.
35. My supervisor tells teachers to make do with what they have.
36. My supervisor assigns duty during planning period.
37. My supervisor "nit picks" on evaluations.
38. My supervisor expects paperwork to be done "yesterday" with no notice.
39. My supervisor overemphasizes control.
40. My supervisor does not delegate responsibility.
41. My supervisor does not involve me in decisions.
42. My supervisor uses the words "I" and "my" too frequently.
43. My supervisor is rigid and unflexible.
44. My supervisor does not apply procedures consistently.
45. My supervisor fails to hold people accountable.
46. My supervisor fails to follow up.
47. My supervisor has rules but does not always enforce them.
48. My supervisor makes "snap judgments."
49. My supervisor does not listen to both sides of the story before making a decision.
50. My supervisor implements the latest fads without thorough knowledge.
51. My supervisor bases evaluations on a short observation.
52. My supervisor does not evaluate situations carefully before taking action.
53. My supervisor makes decisions as "knee jerk" reactions to an incident.

The Preparation of 21st Century School Leaders: A North Carolina Response to National Standards and National Tests

Martha B. Hudson
University Of North Carolina, Greensboro

Ronald D. Williamson
University Of North Carolina, Greensboro

Abstract

Educational leadership programs are confronted by many complex issues–greater accountability for training school leaders, clearly articulated standards for school leader performance, national testing of applicants, and increasing demand for qualified school leaders. This paper describes one NC program's response to such issues. It describes a study designed to elicit student perceptions and to investigate the impact of program changes on students and others affected by those changes. Initial findings suggest that students experience positive changes over their time in the program, including an understanding of the importance of core knowledge grounded in practice to their future success as school leaders.

Introduction

As the role of educational leader becomes ever more complex, finding qualified candidates is both more difficult and more important. Anderson (1991) suggested that the decline in qualified candidates represents a recognition that the principal's job is more complicated than ever before. The Educational Research Service (ERS) (1998) confirmed in an exploratory study that the problem is nationwide. Across the districts polled, about 50% of respondents reported a shortage of qualified candidates. The shortage was a problem for all types of communities and at all grade levels. Inadequate compensation was the most frequently cited reason for the shortage, while the stress of the job and the long hours involved were also mentioned.

While the job is increasingly complex and the challenges growing, Hoyle, English, and Steffy (1998) maintain that informed leadership in our schools is more important than ever before. Much depends on the quality of our leaders, both at the school level and beyond. Those who provide that leadership need more than skills–desire, hard work, and a driving commitment are also required.

It is critical, therefore, that preparation programs recognize the increasing complexity and importance of school leadership and ensure that quality candidates are ready to meet the challenges of the contemporary principalship. In North Carolina, a committee created by the General Assembly studied the problem and framed recommendations as follows:

> Recent changes in the public schools have placed increasing demands on public school administrators. Research on effective schools and the movement toward site-based decision-making have identified the principal as a key factor in efforts to improve schools. It is imperative therefore that competent persons be attracted to and prepared for a career in school administration. (Quality Candidate Committee, 1994)

The concerns raised in North Carolina were representative of concerns expressed in other states. In Anderson's review of principal preparation programs, he noted that practicing administrators have long been dissatisfied with their graduate training. According to Anderson, "the central problem appears to be that most university programs present knowledge about school administration, but do not help students develop skills to translate that knowledge into practice" (1991, p. 6). Given this belief, Anderson criti-

cized traditional training programs for "not providing the field-based experiences necessary for developing outstanding principals" (p. 9). Similarly, the University Council for Educational Administration (1987) cited the lack of preparation programs relevant to the job-related demands encountered by school administrators as one problem of principal preparation. Concerns were also expressed by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (1989), which suggested a year long field residency to address this shortfall, and The National Commission for the Principalship (1990), which called for preparation programs based on the realities of the workplace.

Hoyle, English, and Steffy (1998), identified dozens of demographic, social and economic, technological, and educational trends that affect the work of contemporary educational leaders. They maintained that preparation programs must prepare future leaders to appreciate these dynamic and interacting trends, and be able to shape our schools accordingly. They suggested that such programs would depart from traditional full-time study on university campuses, involving both campus-based and clinical faculty, in addition to combining course content with related field or clinical learning.

The Changing Context for Preparation of School Leaders

In the early 1990s, the North Carolina General Assembly launched an initiative to examine administrator preparation programs in the state. At the time, there was tremendous variety among the programs in North Carolina, with significant differences in the perceptions of quality by prospective administrators completing such programs and their employers (Quality Candidate Committee, 1994). For the most part, prospective principals could be licensed by taking a few classes and earning an endorsement to a masters degree in another area.

The General Assembly established an Educational Leadership Task Force, which concluded that administrator training programs and entrance standards to those programs should be improved. Task Force members believed that strengthening leadership training would improve the quality of the state's public schools.

As a result of the Task Force's recommendations, the state disestablished all "certification only" and master's level administrator preparation programs. To replace these programs, the state invited the sixteen campuses of the state university system to submit proposals for the creation of a new graduate-level program, the Master of School Administration (MSA). This competitive proposal process resulted in a reduction in the number of Master's programs to seven (later nine) across the state.

The request for proposals specified a number of criteria which would be used to judge the merits of each proposal. Among the more significant were an emphasis on a common core of knowledge and skills grounded in practice, the use of varied methods of instruction, and the integration of clinical components throughout the program. Another requirement of the new programs was that they should provide students with a significant, active, full-time internship experience.

Changes were also made in the requirements for obtaining initial licensure as a school leader. Rather than merely taking a few courses to add certification to an existing masters degree, aspiring school leaders were required to complete the full course of study for the new MSA degree. Additionally, candidates for licensure were required to pass the School Leaders Licensure Assessment, developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS), and designed to measure a student's capacity to meet the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996).

Standards for School Leaders

In 1993, the state legislature created the Standards Board for Public School Administration and charged it with establishing standards for the licensure of school administrators in North Carolina. The Standards Board, after several years of work and extensive consultations with experts and practitioners across the state, created a set of ten standards identifying what the state's future school leaders should believe, know,

and be able to do. The levels of knowledge, skill, and the professional perspective expected of candidates were specified for each of the ten standards (North Carolina Standards Board, 1998).

Simultaneously, at the national level a set of standards was also being developed for school leaders (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996). While the performance domains identified in the North Carolina standards were greater in number and of greater specificity, they closely paralleled the six national standards for school leaders. Both the national standards (Table 1) and those developed for North Carolina emphasize the complexity of the leadership role (Bolman & Deal, 1997), the importance of moral and ethical grounding (Kouzes & Posner, 1993; Sergiovanni, 1992; 1994), the value of working closely with parents and community (Comer, 1996; Epstein & Salinas, 1993; Prestine, 1991; Sergiovanni, 1994), and the importance of student learning as the primary function of schools (Newman, 1991).

Licensure Exam

Accompanying the adoption of state and national standards, a consortium of states (Illinois, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, and the District of Columbia) contracted with the Educational Testing Service (ETS) to develop a licensure assessment. Known as the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), this group, under the auspices of the Council of Chief State School Officers, merged their individual state standards into six ISLLC standards and worked with the Educational Testing Service to develop a practice-grounded, problem-based examination that would assist states in determining that prospective administrators were "safe to practice . . . a mechanism that helps ensure that only individuals who possess important knowledge and skills enter into professional practice" (Educational Testing Service, 1997, p. 6).

This determination would be based on scores on the School Leaders Licensure Assessment, scored using

Table 1
Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards

Standard 1	A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.
Standard 2	A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.
Standard 3	A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.
Standard 4	A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.
Standard 5	A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.
Standard 6	A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Council of Chief State School Officers (1996). *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards for School Leaders.* Washington, DC: Author.

rubrics closely aligned to the standards. In other words, students would be expected to answer practice- and problem-based questions in ways which demonstrated that their knowledge, dispositions, and performances were consistent with the standards. Introduced in January 1998, this test is now used to determine who is licensed to practice as a school administrator in North Carolina.

Varying from traditional paper and pencil tests, the School Leaders Licensure Assessment asked students to respond to a series of authentic tasks, each designed to elicit the student's thinking and approaches to resolving complex and occasionally contentious leadership issues. Composed of four sections, the six-hour test expected students to use documents and data from real-life school situations, and critically examine the strategies used by practicing school leaders in a variety of situations. For example, in one short vignette (Educational Testing Service, 1997), students were asked to evaluate a principal's action.

Example 1:

> Vignette: It is early December and the students in an elementary school are practicing for the annual holiday concert. A parent phones the school to insist that her child not be required to sing any of the Christmas songs. The principal excuses the child from participation in the music practice.
>
> *Do you agree with the principal's action? Give a rationale, citing factors that are relevant to a principal's decision in such situations.*

The scoring rubric that accompanied this example revealed a student could agree or disagree with the principal's decision as long as key components, linked to the standards, appeared in the answer. The best possible score (2) on this particular item, for instance, required the following components:

Example 1: scoring rubric for maximum points.

> Response specifically cites the civil and/or religious rights of the parent/student, and includes at least one of the following:
>
> - meeting with the parent and student to discuss the objections;
> - suggesting some alternative activity for the student;
> - examining the content of the concert to determine its appropriateness for all students.

Other sections of the test presented more complex cases, with examples of data and documents that students could use in responding to questions about the case. For example, students were provided with a set of documents about a school (e.g., fact sheet, achievement data, school improvement plan, parent letter), given a description of a scenario, and then asked to respond to a series of questions such as:

- Based on your understanding of learning and teaching and larger educational issues, how would you characterize the broader challenges faced by this school?
- Outline strategies you would implement to elicit the community's support of the school improvement plan.

In response to these events–the demand for greater accountability, the revision of licensure requirements, the adoption of leadership standards, and the use of a national licensure test–the faculty at a medium sized state university located in the Piedmont area of North Carolina, rethought their entire program and implemented changes consistent with the initiatives.

Programmatic Responses to Changes

North Carolina's requirements for the new MSA programs were consistent with the thinking of Hoyle, English, and Steffy (1998), who maintained that the ideal preparation program combines an extensive knowledge base with clinical experience. In their revision of the American Association of School Administrator's (AASA) standards, they suggested that "the knowledge base undergirding [the standards] is the accumulation of research and wisdom about educational administration as an academic discipline and professional practice" (p. 181). Program faculty agreed and are committed to helping students dis-

cover the meaning and usefulness of theory in the context of practice.

It is easy to say that a program is problem-based and grounded in practice, but much more difficult to accomplish. To live it requires not only familiarity with the knowledge base, but also a commitment to a pedagogy that honors constructivist learning.

Varied Methods of Instruction

In such a program, professors can no longer be simply givers of information (Achilles, 1993; Daresh, 1988). Instead, they must become facilitators as students construct their own learning programs based on meaningful engagement with real school problems.

A number of modifications were incorporated into the required courses and seminars of the MSA program to help students make more explicit connections to practice. Four specific strategies are described in greater detail: the use of case studies, the discussion of vignettes, enhancing the internship, and the use of an exit portfolio.

Case Studies. One way to engage students with problems of practice is to use case studies and problem-based learning activities (Bridges, 1992). Such activities, which may be generated by the professors, students, or other authors, are used throughout the program.

For example, in a course on the principalship, students are presented with several sets of vignettes about "real" school issues, each suggested by a practicing North Carolina principal. In small cohort groups, the students analyze the situation, define the issue, suggest at least two strategies for dealing with it, and describe the advantages and disadvantages of each option. Students are required to grapple with the ambiguity inherent in decision-making and to recognize that for most school problems there is more than one useful strategy.

In a course on organization and governance, students work in groups to analyze cases from Harvard's Roderick MacDougall Center for Case Development and Teaching (1996) that emphasize the role of a school in its local community, and raise issues of collaboration in decision-making, communication, inclusion of various stakeholders, and ethics. As these issues grow out of the cases, students are led back to the standards for guidance in preparing a response.

In the internship seminar, students are asked to prepare a strategic plan in response to a complex case which requires attention to issues of school culture, teaching and learning, and professional development. What makes this activity a problem-based learning is the requirement to present the plan to a group of "superintendent types," who provide feedback.

Vignettes. Another technique frequently used to ground teaching in practice is the use of short vignettes similar to those on the licensure test. On the test, these vignettes typically posit a situation in which a principal is about to or has taken some action. The vignettes developed by the MSA faculty help students apply their learning to real problems of practice. For example, one such vignette reads:

> A teacher reports rumors from students that another student is frequently beaten by her parents. The principal asks the teacher to meet with him in two weeks to let him know of any further developments.
>
> *Do you agree with the principal's action? Give a rationale, citing factors that are relevant to a principal's decision in such situations.*

In this example, there is no one right or wrong answer. Instead, students are encouraged to think about what additional information they would need to address the situation, who might be involved, and what standards would guide their decision-making. Another such vignette reads:

> During the school year the parents of a first grader scheduled a meeting with their child's principal. Their daughter had been referred for evaluation because of potential learning problems. The parents begged the principal not to sign the

referral form because they didn't want their child "labeled." They did, however, want their child to get extra help at school. The principal decided not to sign the referral, but asked the resource teacher to work with the child.

How would you assess the principal's actions in light of teaching and learning needs of students? Give a rationale, citing factors that a principal should consider in such situations.

Again, there is no easy answer. The student is required to think about how and why they would respond. What is the bottom line here? How will I gather the information I need to make the right decision? Who needs to be involved? What are the legal and ethical issues to be considered? By asking themselves such questions, students begin to see how standards for administrators apply directly to problems of practice. Because such vignettes are short, they are easily incorporated in classes, simulate the testing situation, and give ample opportunity for students to create their own rubrics as they discuss and process their answers. By thinking about both group and individual responses, students learn that the standards can serve as the framework for solving any problem. This results in the transfer of learning, not of specific solutions, but of the larger problem-solving process.

Internship. The structure and purpose of the internship was also modified. Consistent with state-wide requirements, the MSA program now includes the equivalent of a full year internship. Full-time students spend a large part of the second year in schools, averaging about three and one-half days per week at their sites. Typically, sites are chosen to provide experiences at more than one level (elementary, middle, high) with mentors who serve as both positive role models and partners in reflective practice. Part-time students, who continue to teach while studying for their degree, serve an academic year internship with the principal of their school. In addition to this, they serve two summer internships, which provide opportunities to experience different mentors and work in schools at different levels. The summer experience gives them the opportunity to be full-time administrators.

Weekly seminars run concurrent with the internships. They include a cohort of student interns and provide opportunities to process and "make sense" of their field experiences. Students present case studies based on their internships. Discussion of the cases is not about "fixing" the problem, but rather uncovering the underlying issues and using the standards as a framework for examining processes for resolving it. Seminar members also visit schools and hear from practitioners. Most of all, the seminars bring the school into the university classroom, fostering dialogue and reflection and helping students to connect their studies to their practice in schools.

Exit Portfolio. Vignettes and case studies provide an opportunity for students to examine specific leadership issues. They are useful because of their brevity and their ability to focus quickly and tightly on a few key issues. At the other end of the continuum is a strategy that involves students over a longer term in a larger project–the portfolio. In their first core course, students write a personal platform, a short document that reflects their core beliefs about education and the practice of school leadership. After multiple revisions, language emerges for those beliefs, language that will guide their practice. Over the course of the MSA program, students are encouraged to revisit and revise this platform and a "final" version is included in their portfolio. The portfolio also includes the reflective journals which students keep during their internships and submit for faculty feedback. Other items in the portfolio which are grounded in the internship are an assessment of school culture, an environmental scan, and an action research project for each student.

All of the core classes address issues concerned with school culture. By the time students start their internship, they have a good understanding of what to look for in assessing the culture of the school. Their assessment becomes a part of the portfolio.

A wider look at the school is provided by the environmental scan. Various sources are used to gather information about the school community and the various stakeholders (e.g. demographics, major employers, voting preferences and records). The scan

also includes an examination of the school, its personnel, and its practices, paying particular attention to differences which may exist between espoused theory and the theory actually in use. Based on these data, students identify needs and make recommendations. The object is not to gather massive amounts of data, but to make sense of it–to analyze and synthesize it in ways that lead to an understanding and appreciation of the information in the context of school leadership.

Finally, an action research project is designed, which addresses an identified school need. Students identify the problem, consider various alternatives, implement one of them, evaluate the results, and make recommendations.

Student Response to Program Changes

In order to fully understand the implications of the changes to the preparation programs and to gauge their effect, an assessment of the changes was initiated. The focus of this investigation was to identify those factors which motivated students to enter the program, and to elicit student perceptions about the quality of program components, including their classroom and internship experiences. Since data gathering coincided with the integration of standards into the program, it was expected that student perceptions would also reflect the success of the integration effort.

Initial data were compiled from a student survey administered in the month prior to graduation. At this point, selected groups of students participated in focused interviews in which their perceptions of the quality of the program and their preparation were elicited (Williamson & Hudson, 1998a).

Based on the experiences gained from this initial study, data collection was refined for subsequent years to consist of data from a student survey administered on entry to the program, an analysis of student writing about the reasons they aspire to school leadership, and a review of program documents (Williamson & Hudson, 1999).

These are the first stages of a longer study that will investigate the impact of these changes on students throughout their program and upon their entry to school leadership positions. Additional data will be collected from principals working with students during their internship, from exit surveys upon graduation, from employers during their initial employment as a school leader, and from placement data maintained by the School of Education.

The surveys and interviews which have already been conducted provided the researchers with information about whether the program was actually preparing students to think and act in ways consistent with the standards. Survey questions that reflected the standards aimed at identifying the elements of the program which were perceived to be both valuable and useful. The interviews and student writings gave the researchers insight into those questions, as well as a sense of which critical events molded and shaped student thinking about leadership, and whether or not that thinking changed over time.

There are some early indications of success. Since the initiation of the study, the licensure examination has been administered four times and all the students have passed, indicating that they are "safe to practice." Students graduating in the spring or summer of 1998 were surveyed about various MSA program elements. Questions dealt with problems of practice and readiness, both for the licensure test and for practice as school leaders. Students rated program elements on "their value and perceived usefulness to you as an aspiring school leader" using a scale of 1 to 4, with 4 being "high value." The results of this are detailed in Table 2 (Williamson & Hudson, 1998b).

Overall, students responded positively, indicating both that they felt prepared and that the preparation would be useful. A comparable survey administered to entering students affirmed the importance of standards-related program activities (Hudson and Williamson, 1999). These aspiring school leaders also rated program elements grounded in the standards as important to their preparation.

The data collected in these surveys were used by MSA program faculty to strengthen and refine service to

Table 2
Student Responses to Program Survey

Question	Mean for:	
	"the program prepared me"	"the activity will be useful to me"
Understanding the issues and problems faced by school leaders	3.92	4.00
Acting with integrity, fairness and in an ethical manner	3.85	4.00
Grounding in the social, ethical, and moral context of leadership	3.77	4.00
Knowledge of state standards for school leaders	3.77	3.77
Development, articulation and implementation of a vision of learning shared and supported by the school community	3.77	4.00
Advocating, nurturing and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth	3.77	4.00
Understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal and cultural context	3.69	3.85
Opportunity to interact with practitioners	3.67	4.00
Understanding the theory on school leadership	3.62	3.54
Preparation for the licensure examination	3.62	3.77
Responding to diverse community interests	3.46	3.92
Collaborating with families and community members	3.31	3.92
Ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient and effective learning community	3.08	3.54
Mobilizing community resources	2.61	3.77

4=high value; 3=more high than low value; 2=more low than high value; 1=low value (Williamson & Hudson, 1998b).

students. In several instances, the process led to changes in the program. For example, while not "low," the 1998 graduates perceived themselves as less well prepared on items requiring collaboration with their communities than on other items. That finding resulted in additional attention to collaboration with communities in core courses and internship seminars.

Other Indications of Early Success

There are other early indications that the changes in the program were successful (Williamson & Hudson, 1998a). One full-time student entered the program convinced and insistent that her school, seen from a teacher's viewpoint, was perfect in every way. Over the course of the first year, multiple opportunities to examine issues of practice from a more theoretical perspective helped her to see her school differently. She can now see it through an administrator's eyes, with a new awareness of the meaning and implications of practice. Today, she appreciates what is good, but raises questions about other practices and, seeing them in the larger context, can generate ideas for improvement.

Almost all the students report that they have changed as a result of participating in the program. One student remarked:

> I've grown much more reflective since entering this program. I used to think leadership was just about telling people what to do, and that there were set answers to problems. I've come to recognize that is not true. I've become more analytical. I process things more and I rely on others to help me think through my options.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Revisions of student platforms, analyses of critical incidents during the internship, and reflections on program experiences indicated that students understood the importance of core knowledge to their future success as school leaders. They reported that they have come to such understanding through the concerted efforts of program faculty to ground that core knowledge in problems of practice and to ensure that students see the relationship between theory and practice, and understand that good practice is grounded in the principles reflected in the standards.

As one recent graduate reflected,

> In making decisions about real case studies, I found myself drawing on a lot of information from [MSA classes]. This is a case of the ideal affecting practice. Without the background provided by the MSA program, the internship would have been meaningless. Armed with knowledge concerning the major concepts that administrators must deal with, however, I am able to make heads-and-tails of what goes on in school.

Many of the students in this cohort talked about how their personal platforms changed over the course of their program, as a result of their course work, their internships, and the pedagogy that connected the two. One student, citing a particular incident in the internship, said,

> I see a direct link between this experience and the MSA program. First, it helped me see the school as a "big picture" and the importance of seeing all the small tasks and duties as underpinned by one philosophy of practice. The "platform" is crucial because it informs even the tiniest decisions.

Another student reflected,

> My updated Personal Platform is more like a personal educational philosophy or pedagogy. Since writing my draft platform, I have drastically increased my learning and experience. These, paired with thought and self-inspection, have led me to adopt a more holistic platform. I still recognize the importance of the principal in determining the success of a school; however, I now see the student as the focus of all education.

The reflections of another student illustrated the impact of the program on his personal development. This student said of himself:

> I feel that I have "grown up" as a professional. I have learned that there is more than one way to get things done in education, and if you try to do it all by yourself with your own ideas, you will more than likely fail. . . . I used to think that leader meant boss. That belief existed because that is all I have ever worked for, a boss. Leadership is much more than telling people what you want done. It is about leading people to change. It's also about helping people gain efficacy during that change.

"I'm a different person," said another student. She continued,

> I thought it was about learning the answers and sharing them with others. I leave full of ideas, strategies, ways to do things but know that to be successful I will need to work with others, to continue to grow, and to always search for the "right" answer, while knowing one may not exist.

Students valued their experiences while in the MSA program. Their responses to the survey and their comments reflected the way in which the program made them more reflective and contributed to an appreciation that, for most school problems, there is more than one "right" answer.

Implications for Principal Preparation

Data from this study indicated that the standards for school leaders can serve as a useful framework for modifications to principal preparation programs. Standards can be used to enhance the core knowledge upon which preparation programs have traditionally been based, complementing that knowledge with the requirement to apply it to "real-life" school problems. The successful application of such knowledge when

confronting these problems allayed concerns which had been raised about the utility of preparation programs. Professors and students alike have begun to talk about the "foundations of practice," rather than seeing them as separate and disconnected.

The positive experiences of these students offer guidance and encouragement to other preparation programs. The addition of national standards and standards-based tests adds a measure of accountability to preparation programs. Readiness for the licensure test becomes important to students, and programs must respond. That response requires cooperation and collaboration among faculty as they seek to work together in support of the program. Though such efforts may reduce individual autonomy, the outcome can be a stronger, more cohesive program that is valued by students.

These students appreciated the program's clear and explicit link between theory and practice. Standards-based programs that ground teaching in problems of practice can lead to enhanced connections with schools. Through the internship, school visits by professors, and the weaving of "real" practitioners into classes and seminars, new connections are made. Many of the practice-based examples used in university classrooms come directly from schools, giving students multiple opportunities to grapple with real issues, and to understand and apply theory in those contexts.

The support of both the faculty and their fellow students helps students as they gain an understanding of the foundations of practice. They report relying on one another as they process and think through problems. One student cited as helpful: "the many opportunities I have had to reflect on my experiences and to share my growing beliefs as well as my hopes and disappointments with my classmates." That student and others specifically asked for "a continuing network of formal and informal support" with each other and with the faculty. For preparation programs, responding to such valid student needs raises issues of resources and opportunities for new relationships with school-based practitioners.

Educational leadership programs are confronted by many complex issues–greater accountability for training school leaders, clearly articulated standards for school leader performance, national testing of applicants, and increasing demand for school leaders. Together, these factors place competing and often conflicting demands on leadership preparation programs.

As states alter preparation and licensure procedures, it is essential that university faculty investigate and examine the quality of their programs on a regular basis. Integral to such efforts is listening to students–hearing their perceptions, being attentive to the diverse needs reflected in the prevalence of increasingly diverse educational settings, and balancing the requirements for adherence to state and national standards with the need for responsiveness to students. Only by embracing such practices do preparation programs maintain their strength and vitality.

References

Achilles, C. M. (1993). If all I needed were facts, I'd just buy your book: Why professors are important. *People and Education, 1*(4), 424–436.

Anderson, M. E. (1991). *Principals: How to train, recruit, select, induct, and evaluate leaders for America's schools.* Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1997). *Reframing organizations* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bridges, E. M. (1992). *Problem based learning for administrators.* Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Comer, J. P. (1996). *Rallying the whole village: the Comer process for reforming education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). *Interstate school leaders licensure consortium: Standards for school leaders.* Washington, DC: Author.

Daresh, J. (1988). Learning at Nellie's elbow: Will it truly improve the preparation of educational administrators? *Planning and Changing, 19*(3), 178–187.

Educational Research Service. (1998). *Is there a shortage of qualified candidates for openings in the principalship?* Alexandria, VA: Author.

Educational Testing Service. (1997). *Candidate information bulletin for the school leaders licensure assessment.* Princeton, NJ: Author.

Epstein, J., & Salinas, K. (1993). *School and family partnerships.* Baltimore, MD: Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning.

Hoyle, J. R., English, F. W., & Steffy, B. E. (1998). *Skills for successful 21st century school leaders: Standards for peak performers.* Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Hudson, M. B., & Williamson, R. (1999, February). *Preparing school leaders: Examining student perspectives of quality programs.* Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Hilton Head, SC.

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (1993). *Credibility.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

National Commission for the Principalship. (1990). *Principals for our changing schools: Preparation and certification.* Fairfax, VA: National Commission for the Principalship.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (1989). *Improving the preparation of school administrators: An agenda for reform.* Charlottesville, VA: Author.

Newman, F. (1991). Linking restructuring to authentic student achievement. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72*(6), 458–463.

North Carolina Standards Board. (1998). *Performance Domains for the Principalship — Revised Final Draft.* Raleigh, NC: Author.

Prestine, N. (1991). Shared decision-making in restructuring essential schools: The role of the principal. *Planning and Changing, 23*(3/4), 160–177.

Quality Candidate Committee. (1994). *The selection of leaders for North Carolina's schools: Admissions criteria and employment procedures.* Raleigh, NC: Author.

Roderick MacDougall Center for Case Development and Teaching. (1996). *Harvard Graduate School of Education Catalogue of K–12 case materials.* Cambridge, MA: Author.

Sergiovanni, T. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. (1994). *Building community in schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

University Council for Educational Administration. (1987). *Leaders for America's schools: The report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education.* Tempe, AZ: Author.

Williamson, R., & Hudson, M. (1998a, February). *Identifying value in administrator preparation programs: Varying perspectives.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Tampa, FL.

Williamson, R., & Hudson, M. (1998b, November). *Meeting national standards: Preparing school leaders for diverse settings.* Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Southern Regional Council in Educational Administration, Savannah, GA.

Williamson, R., & Hudson, M. (1999, April). *Preparing tomorrow's principals: Meeting emerging challenges.* Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, PQ, Canada.

2000 SRCEA Yearbook

Call for Manuscripts

The *SRCEA Yearbook* is the official yearbook of the *Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration.* The *Yearbook* is nationally refereed and the journal is published in the Fall of each year.

FOCUS: Manuscripts should be original works neither previously published nor concurrently submitted for publication in other journals. Manuscripts should be written clearly and concisely for a diverse audience, especially educational leadership and management professionals in K–12 and higher education. Topics should reflect the theme of the 1999 SRCEA conference, "The Preparation of Leaders: Power, Policy and Politics." Priority in the selection of manuscripts will be given to authors whose papers were accepted and presented at the 1999 conference.

FORMAT: Manuscripts should follow the guidelines of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (4th ed.). Manuscripts should not exceed 25 typed, double-spaced, consecutively numbered pages, including all cited references. Submitted manuscripts which do not follow the APA format will be returned to the author without editorial review. Illustrative materials, including charts, tables, figures, etc., should be clearly labeled.

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES: Submit four (4) copies of the manuscript for editorial review. Manuscripts should also include a cover page with the following information: author's full name, institutional or professional affiliation, return mailing address, telephone number, full name of co-authors with their institutional or professional affiliation, and the full manuscript title. Also note on page if the paper was presented at the 1999 SCREA Annual Conference. Do not include any identifying information in the text pages. Manuscript deadline is **February 15, 2000.** If accepted, authors will be notified of publication and asked to submit the manuscript on computer disk. There is no publication fee.

Dr. Frances K. Kochan, Editor
SRCEA Yearbook
Truman Pierce Institute
Auburn University
2195 Haley Center
Auburn University, AL 36849-5228
Voice: (334) 844-4488
Fax: (334) 844-0558
E-mail: kochafr@mail.auburn.edu

Leading the Technological Revolution: A New Challenge for Principals

Warren C. Hope
Florida A&M University

Robert G. Stakenas
Florida State University

Abstract

Computer technology has the potential to be a useful tool in school restructuring. Technology can be utilized to create more effective and efficient methods of managing, organizing, planning, and, most importantly, teaching. Considerable attention has been given to training inservice teachers to integrate technology into their practice. However, less attention has been devoted to principals' computer technology professional development, even though principals are recognized as indispensable to the process of curricular change and instructional improvement in schools. This paper focuses on the need for principals to acquire the expertise in computer technology which will enable them to provide the leadership needed to transform their schools. Three technology-related roles for principals, role model, instructional leader, and visionary, are identified and discussed in this paper.

Introduction

While many enterprises have succeeded in accommodating and integrating new technology into the fabric of their operations, education continues to struggle with the challenge of how best to use computers to achieve objectives. Though there are schools that can relate technology success stories (Morrison, Lowther, & Demuelle, 1999), in most schools computer technology has not yet had the impact envisioned by many educators. Kearsley and Lynch (1994) suggest that this state of affairs is because of a lack of knowledge regarding how best to use technology, coupled with a failure to provide appropriate and sufficient training opportunities.

This paper examines the professional development needs of principals in the area of computer technology, and discusses their role in transforming schools using this technology. Comparisons are made with the computer technology professional development needs of teachers. The discussion refers to teachers who are licensed individuals already employed in school districts, rather than aspiring teachers attending colleges and universities.

Principal Professional Development and Technology

The principal, more than any other educator, is the key to the adoption and use of technology by teachers (Cooley & Reitz, 1997). The increasing use of computer technology in education has the potential to alter the teaching and learning environment, influence student outcomes, and enhance teacher productivity. Since instructional leadership is one of the roles typically assigned to principals, it is incumbent upon them to understand how computer technology can best be used in the school and to facilitate its implementation. This understanding is acquired through experience and professional development activities that familiarize principals with the features, capabilities and limitations of various technologies.

To date, however, technology professional development has focused almost exclusively on training inservice teachers to integrate technology into the teaching and learning process to improve student learning outcomes, as this has been the overwhelming preoccupation of educational leaders and decision-makers. Far less attention has been devoted to helping principals become knowledgeable about computer technology (Kearsley, 1990), and assisting them in identifying and integrating various applications into their daily work. Without professional development training for principals that focuses on current and future technologies and how they can be used in the work and learning environment, computer technology

will continue to be an underused resource in schools.

Hope, Kelley, and Kinard (1999) surveyed principals in North Florida school districts in an attempt to identify their technology professional development needs. In response to the statement, "I have participated in professional development that demonstrated how principals can promote the integration of computer technology into the school curriculum," 58% of the principals who responded indicated that they had not received this type of professional development.

Thus, it can be argued that educational decision-makers "placed the cart before the horse," both with principals and teachers, in regard to computer technology. That is, computer technology was introduced into schools before principals and teachers were familiar with its capabilities and limitations, or even understood how it could be integrated into their work. Nevertheless, since computer technology was expected to revolutionize school processes, it was clearly something which must be obtained. The tendency to place computer technology in schools before principals and teachers have had any training to enable them to utilize it effectively to enhance personal productivity, teaching, and learning continues today.

Several authors have stated that before computer technology can be effectively integrated into the teaching and learning process, teachers first need to be familiar with and aware of its capabilities (Merrill, Hammons, Tolman, Christensen, Vincent, & Reynolds, 1992; Simonson & Thompson, 1997). This is just as applicable to principals. Principals need to be familiar and comfortable with computer technology and its capabilities in order to integrate it into their everyday duties, assist teachers to integrate it into their practice, and promote a vision of technology in the curriculum. Without a thorough understanding of computer technology's capabilities, principals will not be ready to provide the leadership needed to restructure their schools through technology.

Today, it is widely acknowledged that ongoing staff development for teachers is essential if they are to use computer technology and integrate it into the teaching and learning process effectively (Cooley & Reitz, 1997). It seems obvious that principals also need continual professional development in the area of technology.

Many school districts have a Management Information System (MIS) that principals are expected to be familiar with and use. By accessing the district's information system, principals can obtain demographic, enrollment, and attendance data which they use to identify trends, key factors when considering school improvements. On a national level, how principals are applying computer technology to accomplish administrative tasks is not clearly defined. Research that identifies the specific types of computer applications principals are using to accomplish work tasks has yet to be reported in the literature. In addition, the amount of professional development training principals have received specifically aimed at increasing their computer technology skills in order to facilitate the integration of technology into the curriculum is yet to be determined.

There appears to be a general assumption that principals are already knowledgeable about technology and what it can accomplish in the work environment. However, like many teachers who have yet to integrate technology into their practice (Office of Technology Assessment, 1995), there are many principals who have not employed the power of computer technology in their managerial and administrative capacities. If the professional development opportunities sponsored in districts are primarily designed for practicing teachers, how will principals receive the knowledge and skills they need to apply technology to their work and lead the curriculum restructuring effort which will be needed to enable computers to be used more fully?

The Roles Principals Take in the Implementation of Computer Technology

In designing professional development experiences specifically for principals, it is important to examine the role(s) they assume as technology leaders. We suggest there are three primary roles that principals fill. Each of these roles is best performed by principals

with expertise, who understand the capability of the technology, and who have experienced the benefits of using it.

The Principal as Role Model

It is important for the principal to serve as a role model in utilizing technology. This perspective requires that the principal be perceived as a capable user of computer technology, engaged in activities such as using e-mail and word processing applications to communicate, accessing databases for student data, reviewing spreadsheets for budget data, and searching the Internet for information.

In addition, principals need to be able to demonstrate their expertise and familiarity with instructional software and the productivity applications that teachers use in class, since it is reasonable to expect principals to be involved in decisions about the purchase of software that will eventually be used in their schools. Principals who are knowledgeable about the performance capability of instructional software send a powerful message about technology to teachers. For example, there are numerous gradebook programs available that allow teachers flexibility and efficiency in recording student information and calculating students' performance results. Principals can highlight their commitment to computer technology and teachers' integration of it by learning to use the gradebook application themselves, and then personally training teachers in its use.

If a school has a computer lab with an integrated learning system (ILS), then the principal should be familiar with its operations. Modeling the need to become adept and to learn about technology can be accomplished by frequent visits, reading and responding to students' performance results, working with students as they complete tasks using the ILS, and talking to teachers about what is and is not working. Often, an ILS is expected to make dramatic improvements in students' test scores and to boost academic achievement. A principal who understands the role of an ILS in a school and is knowledgeable about its operations, can facilitate students' acquisition of skills and support teachers in their use of the ILS with students.

The Principal as Instructional Leader

As the instructional leader, it is the responsibility of the principal to facilitate the integration of computer technology into the curriculum. This requires an ability to provide staff development or, at the very least, a knowledge of what teachers need in order to integrate technology into their practice. Also important is a desire to promote the appropriate use of technology in various learning contexts. In this scenario, it is incumbent upon the principal to understand how technology can be used to support the pedagogical strategies employed by teachers to enhance student learning. This entails an understanding of learning models and how technology can support teaching and learning within particular instructional models (Nash, 1998). Central to the role of instructional leader is the ability to understand various applications and how they can be used in the teaching and learning environment.

Software today falls into several categories. The best known are drill and practice, games, simulations, tutorials, productivity tools, web-browsers, and integrated learning systems (ILS). Understanding how these applications can be used in teaching and learning, and knowing the extent to which they are applicable to the curriculum being delivered in a particular school, is very important. Software as a tool for teachers is also a key aspect of integrating technology in schools. In a time when more productivity and accountability is demanded, principals' expertise in assisting teachers to use technology that helps them to work "smarter" rather than "harder" is a professional necessity.

The Principal as Visionary

A third role for principals relative to computer technology is that of a visionary. To be visionary is to be future-oriented, with the ability to anticipate and identify emerging trends that will eventually have to be addressed. The principal as visionary must look ahead into the future to identify social, cultural, and

technological changes to which schools must respond if they are to remain socially viable institutions. It has been suggested that under the organizational and instructional practices currently in use, the power of technology will not realize its potential in schools (David, 1994).

In the role of visionary, the principal must empower and lead others to institute organizational and curricular changes that recognize and utilize technology as a pivotal tool in achieving educational outcomes. Visionary principals must understand how to take advantage of technology so that it can be employed in new and emerging contexts of effective schooling. As a visionary, the principal understands how to employ technology in a constructivist learning environment (Nash, 1998), where collaborative work groups, block scheduling, and exploratory learning are the norms. The visionary principal must be able to communicate an image of technology to be used in schools that anticipates the realities of the 21st century which students will face.

The visionary principal must determine the role computer technology is to have in a school setting by understanding students' academic needs and how the curriculum should integrate technology to accomplish goals. Technology acquisition and use should be based upon student and curricular needs. As a visionary, the principal should seek to acquire technology resources that are not only up-to-date but also have the future "built into them." Principals need to be aware of Moore's law, which states that computers double in their computing power every 18 months, making it very difficult to stay current, while equipment and software become outdated quickly (Provenzo, 1996).

Computer Technology and Principals' Work Environment: Some Reasons Why the Transformation Has Not Occurred

Despite the essential role of principals in facilitating effective integration of technology in schools, at present there is reason to believe that a significant number of principals are not receiving the professional development assistance that would permit them to function effectively in these three roles. In the study by Hope, Kelley, and Kinard (1999) involving principals in north Florida school districts, 40% of the respondents indicated that they had not participated in any professional development activities that would have prepared them to facilitate teachers' integration of technology into the curriculum. In the same study, 50% of the principals indicated that they had not participated in professional development that would have provided them with an understanding of how best to select hardware and evaluate software for use in the school. Principals were also asked if teachers perceived them as the computer technology leader in their school, and 51% of the principals in the survey answered this statement in the negative.

Principals' use of computer technology to transform their work environment seems to be proceeding slowly. One reason is that computer technology is a relatively new phenomenon, and many principals have had only a limited experience with computer technology in their professional preparation program (Ritchie, 1996). In fact, the age of principals and their fear of technology was mentioned in a recent national publication (Trotter, 1997), as a barrier to the integration of technology in schools. It was suggested that only 5% of principals nationwide were well versed in using computer applications such as word processing, spreadsheets, and presentation software (Richards in Trotter, 1997). The literature is virtually silent with regard to principals' knowledge of instructional software and their understanding of its use and impact in the classroom.

Professional development that would enable principals to evaluate and recommend appropriate software for their schools should be an integral part of training and ongoing professional development. As instructional leaders, this is certainly an area that demands the attention of principals. An alarming finding in Hope, Kelley, and Kinard's (1999) study of principals was that 70% of respondents reported receiving "none" or "a little" when asked about the provision of professional development training in the use of computer technology by their school district.

Like teachers, principals have, over time, established preferred ways of working using familiar manually-oriented resources and routines to accomplish daily tasks. In many instances, tasks requiring the use of computer technology are delegated to a secretary or other clerical personnel. Trotter (1997) suggests that the best way for administrators to learn about technology is by using it. Principals, like teachers, need to experience the advantages of using technology compared to their traditional way of doing things.

A second reason why principals have not rushed to take advantage of the benefits of computer technology is that it requires a significant investment of time. Principals are busy people, with little extra time to learn about computers (Trotter, 1997). For principals, finding time to fit computer technology into their schedule amid all the other things they do is not an easy proposition. Hope, Kelley, and Kinard (1999), in their study of principals and computer technology, sought to identify the most significant barriers to principals learning to use technology. The questionnaire listed eight choices from which principals could rank the most significant barriers. Principals overwhelmingly responded with the choice of "too busy with other demands of the job to learn to use computer technology."

In part because of the time factor, and in recognition of the fact that principals are often inundated by numerous other responsibilities, some districts have introduced a computer technology specialist into schools. Often, computer technology specialists assume the role for principals that computer lab specialists fulfill for teachers. The computer lab with an assigned technology person removed the responsibility from teachers for integrating technology into classroom instruction, and the responsibility for using technology in instruction became the purview of the computer lab specialist. Given this arrangement, the classroom teacher was able to use the scheduled computer lab time as an opportunity to engage in other activities and avoid learning to use the technology (Provenzo, 1996). Likewise, for principals, the computer expert on their staff relieves the principal from having to know computer technology details, attend to technology questions, or resolve many of the school's technology problems. This statement should not be construed as opposition to the practicality of a computer specialist on staff; rather, it recognizes the specialist's possible effect on principals' technology leadership and acquisition of technology skills.

Another reason why technology transformation relative to principals is occurring slowly is because when school districts emphasize computer technology training, they focus primarily on teachers. The vast majority of the literature is preoccupied with detailing how teachers can integrate technology into the classroom. There is a void in the literature relative to computer technology and how principals can apply it to their work. Textbooks such as Maurer and Davidson (1998) and Picciano (1998), which were written to emphasize leaders' role in the technology restructuring process, devote considerable attention to technology planning, its integration into the curriculum, staff development for teachers, and seeking funding sources. However, the kind of professional development which principals need to acquire computer technology skills and apply it to their work is missing.

Principals Have Computer Technology Needs Too

Technology pervades practically every work environment. However, efforts to integrate computer technology into schools have focused on inservice teachers and instructional environments. Teachers are acquiring technology skills through inservice training, workshops, seminars, and conferences, but professional development for principals that assists them to integrate technology into their work has not unfolded with the same fervor as with teachers.

A key component of principals' productivity is their ability to generate information quickly and accurately, and to have immediate access to other information that is required at short notice. Computer technology can be an effective tool for completing tasks such as compiling the numerous reports that must be completed, the storage and retrieval of a multitude of records and documents, and handling the flow of organizational information. Using computer technol-

ogy eliminates redundancy, improves the accuracy of reports, prevents the loss of information, and minimizes expenditure of time, releasing the principal to attend to other matters.

To take advantage of the capabilities of computer technology, principals need professional development opportunities that help them acquire an understanding of the power and the limitations of various technologies, and show them how to select and apply them in their administrative capacity. Professional development training will help principals to acquire expertise in using computer technology and to replace cherished convictions with alternative visions that more closely approximate reality (Kearsley & Lynch, 1994). School districts that fail to provide this support to principals, who have such an important role in the technology restructuring process, are hampering their own technology initiatives.

There is little doubt that principals can benefit tremendously from a knowledge of and ability to take full advantage of the computer technology which is now available. Furthermore, there are others who can benefit from principals' knowledge of computer technology. The question is, are they pursuing and receiving the professional development training they need to use technology effectively in their sphere of work? Are school districts attending to the computer technology needs of principals who could be technology role models for teachers?

For principals to acquire the technology skills they need to improve their productivity entails participation in workshops, seminars, institutes, and conferences specifically designed for them. School districts must be concerned about the level of computer technology expertise of their principals, and, to that end, should offer appropriate training opportunities. This could quite easily begin with a computer technology need assessment, to determine what kind of computer technology professional development to offer them. There are already some school districts that have established technology centers to train school personnel on specific hardware capabilities and software applications. Principals need to become clients of these centers and participate in the training that is being offered.

In the absence of professional development opportunities expressly for principals, the principals could benefit from attending the same workshops, seminars, institutes, and conferences as their teachers attend. It must be understood that not only teachers and students, but the entire educational system, stand to benefit from principals who have experienced computer technology oriented professional development opportunities.

Conclusion

Technology, in various forms, will continue to impact work environments and play a major role in our lives. The ability to use computer technology is an advantage that in these times few can afford to ignore—principals included. Computer technology is creating new ways of accomplishing work and new types of total work environments. It can serve the needs of principals well, but principals must be afforded opportunities to acquire the skills with which to apply it effectively.

School district leaders and decision-makers need to recognize the computer technology needs of principals and address those needs. Principals, too, must take responsibility for their computer technology professional development. If school districts are not responding to principals' technology needs, then it becomes necessary for principals to seek out other providers to obtain this expertise.

If the technological revolution is to become a reality in schools, then principals will have to be at the forefront of that revolution. There is an old saying that you cannot teach that which you do not know. How computer technology is used in schools will in large measure depend on the understanding and actions of school leaders (Provenzo, 1996). When school districts address the technology needs of principals, there are at least three possible outcomes:

1. Principals would realize how using technology enhances their work productivity;

2. Principals would be better situated to help teachers integrate technology into their practice and, ultimately, the curriculum; and

3. Student learning outcomes would be influenced because instructional decision-makers (principals) would be knowledgeable of technology and how it could best be applied in the instructional environment to benefit students.

References

Cooley, V. E., & Reitz, R. J. (1997). Lessons learned in creating a program. *Kappa Delta Pi, 34*(1), 4–9.

David, J. L. (1994). Realizing the promise of technology: A policy perspective. In B. Means (ed.). *Technology and Educational Reform: The Reality Behind the Promise.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Hope, W., Kelley, B. & Kinard, B. (1999). *Perception of training needs: Principals' use of computer technology in the school environment.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education, San Antonio, TX.

Kearsley, G. (1990). *Computers for educational administrators: Leadership in the information age.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Kearsley, G., & Lynch, W. (1994). *Educational technology: leadership perspectives.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

Maurer, M. W., & Davidson, G. S. (1998). *Leadership in instructional technology.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Merrill, P. F., Hammons, K., Tolman, M. N., Christensen, L., Vincent, B. R., & Reynolds, P. L. (1992). *Computers in education.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Morrison, G. R., Lowther, D. L., & Demuelle, L. (1999). *Integrating computer technology into the classroom.* Columbus, OH: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Nash, J. B. (1998). Thinking through the issue of teaching with technology. *UCEA Review, 39*(2), 1, 8, 12–13.

Picciano, A. G. (1998). *Educational leadership and planning for technology.* Columbus, OH: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Provenzo, E. F. (1996). *The educator's brief guide to computers in schools.* Princeton, NJ: Eye on Education, Inc.

Ritchie, D. (1996). The administrative role in the integration of technology. *NASSP Bulletin, 80*(582), 42–52.

Simonson, M. R., & Thompson, A. (1997). *Educational computing foundations.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Trotter, A. (1997). A test of leadership. *Education Week, 17*(11), 30–33.

U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment. (1995). *Teachers and technology: Making the connection (OTA-HER-616).* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

1999 SRCEA Yearbook

Order Form

Name _____

Mailing Address _____

_____

Telephone _____

E-mail _____

Price per copy: $10.00

No. copies _____ Amount enclosed: _____

Make checks payable to *Truman Pierce Institute* and mail to:

The Truman Pierce Institute
Auburn University
2195 Haley Center
Auburn University, AL 36849-5228

The Electronic Portfolio in Leadership Development

Johnetta Hudson
University of North Texas

Abstract

Portfolio assessment is increasingly becoming an integral part of educational administration programs around the country. While assessment portfolios and career portfolios are gaining popularity, the electronic portfolio is still a novelty. This may be due partially to the fact that in many programs the focus has been on teaching about technology rather than on integrating technology into learning. In an information age that revolves around technology, it is imperative that professors of education administration today facilitate the development of technology-literate school leaders for tomorrow. The electronic portfolio as an assessment tool is one way to integrate technology into leadership development. Transforming the traditional paper portfolio into a high-tech electronic one is a step towards the 21st century for leadership development.

Introduction

Student portfolios are increasingly becoming an integral part of educational administration programs around the country. They are used to assess student performance and to spotlight skills and accomplishments that will be of interest to future employers (Gresso, Burkett, & Smith, 1993). While assessment portfolios and career portfolios are gaining popularity, the electronic portfolio as a tool in leadership development remains a novelty. Chambers (1994) states, "in an age of evolving technology centered around computers, it may be impossible for a school leader to effectively lead in this vital area without personal knowledge and skill in the application of these powerful tools" (p.4).

Historically, educational administration preparation programs have separated theory and practice, with much of the emphasis being on theory (Murphy, 1990). This is also true with technology. Learning about the technology itself has been the focus, rather than learning how to integrate technology into learning (Land & Coe, 1999). The electronic portfolio as an assessment tool is one way in which technology can be integrated into leadership development programs.

The impetus to integrate technology into teaching and learning is influenced by several factors; the changing nature of our society, the national Goals 2000 Act, and statewide educational technology initiatives. The changing nature of our society requires that school leaders possess knowledge and an understanding of the new technology which is available to support management functions and promote student learning and professional growth (Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium, 1996). This change is characterized both by our increasing reliance upon technology and the growing diversity of the student population in our nation's schools. The integration of technology into teaching and learning can increase the learning opportunities for all students, as well as prepare them for gainful employment in the 21st century workplace (Cradler & Bridgforth, 1999). The focus on technological literacy for educators is a national priority.

The Goals 2000 Act influenced the need for educators at the K–12 level, as well as in higher education, to become more technologically literate. According to Cradler and Bridgforth (1999), this act encouraged "school planning and the use of technology" (p. 1). Many state education agencies, including Texas, responded to the challenge by developing long-range statewide technology plans that included educator preparation and development.

The long-range plan for technology that was developed by the Texas Education Agency Division of

Instructional Technology includes a provision for "paid professional leave time for training in integrating technologies into teaching and learning, instructional management, professional development, and administration and incentives to encourage preparation of teachers intraining at higher education institutions in appropriate uses of technology" (1996, p. 4). Thus, integrating technology into the leadership development curriculum became a primary focus for our program. The use of the electronic portfolio provided a means through which aspiring school leaders could enhance their technology skills by using technology in their own coursework. Steven Bossert, dean of Syracuse University's school of education, advocated this approach, saying, "Educators will more likely employ and encourage the use of technology, if they have experienced its power themselves" (Perry, 1999, p. 3). It is imperative that professors of educational administration facilitate today the development of technologically literate school leaders for tomorrow.

What Is A Portfolio?

Portfolios are much more than a collection of papers that students write and teachers save. As assessment tools, "portfolios are systematic collections by students and teachers that serve as the basis to examine effort, improvement, process, and achievement as well as to meet the accountability demands usually achieved by more formal testing procedures" (Johns, 1992, p.10). Portfolio assessment is an important part of the new movement towards authentic assessment measures that has become increasingly popular among teachers and administrators (Lankes, 1995).

Like the hard copy portfolio, the electronic portfolio can include case study analyses, professional development plans, reflective journals and reports of action research with accompanying charts and graphs. There are, however, significant differences between the hard copy portfolio and an electronic portfolio, the most obvious of which is that the latter is generated and stored on a computer or disk. Unlike traditional paper-based portfolios, electronic portfolios can be multimedia presentations, incorporating sound, video clips, graphics, clipart, hyperlinks, scrolling text, and links to the World Wide Web with the aid of hypermedia programs such as Microsoft PowerPoint and HyperStudio.

Benefits of Electronic Portfolios

An electronic portfolio offers many advantages for both the professor and the student. The electronic portfolio has the capability of providing a non-linear dynamic presentation of student performance and can be a more efficient way of organizing and viewing student work. Traditional portfolios in the form of notebooks consume large quantities of paper and are cumbersome to transport from classroom to office. Multiple copies of electronic portfolios can be stored on computer disks and transported easily from place to place, transmitted via e-mail, or uploaded onto a website.

The development of any portfolio is not a superficial process. Evans (1996) states, "the intrinsic value of creating a portfolio lies in the inescapable reflective process. It invokes reflection about instructional experiences" (p. 2). She goes on to say, "Steps taken to build a portfolio are steps toward stronger professional character and enriched work ethic." Thus, upon completion of the electronic portfolio, students feel a sense of accomplishment. It is a unique way to display their talents and abilities, and provides them with tools that can be utilized in their work as school leaders.

Appropriate Courses for the Use of the Electronic Portfolio

The electronic portfolio can be used as an assessment tool in any course in which a portfolio would be appropriate. Introduction to School Leadership, School Change, and Instructional Improvement and Staff Development are courses in which I have required this method of assessment. In these courses, students also use computer technology to communicate with cohort members, enhance class presentations and participate in listserv discussions.

At Midwestern State University, students are required to begin the Masters in Educational Leadership with two courses: Technology Tools for School Leaders

and Introduction to School Leadership. Thus, the stuents learn the application of various software programs in the field of school administration right at the beginning of the program, and they are expected to use this knowledge in other courses throughout the remainder of their studies.

The electronic portfolio can be included in the requirements for an internship program, and can also be required for the completion of a degree and/or certification in educational administration. Vision and capabilities of the professor and students are the only factors that limit the use of the electronic portfolio.

Developing an electronic portfolio is not difficult, even for professors and students with limited technological skills. However, in choosing to use this assessment tool, consideration should be given to student skills, the availability of hardware and software, and the compatibility of professor and student platforms and word processing programs, as well as to the type of disk necessary to store the portfolio.

Considerations for Implementation

Student Technological Knowledge and Skills

The creation of an electronic portfolio requires that students have at least basic word processing skills and minimal competence in the use of one or more hypermedia software programs. My experience has been that students who do not possess keyboarding skills can create a portfolio, but the amount of time spent typing with two fingers and learning basic computer operations while simultaneously learning the software program is inordinate and it is initially a frustrating experience for these students. However, the exhilaration and sense of accomplishment they experience once they are able to conquer the challenge amply repays the effort required. One student's journal entry stated, "I sure did enjoy that assignment.... I kicked all the way through it [but] in the end, I was proud of the results. It was worth doing" (K. Meyer, personal communication, June, 1999).

For those students who are already computer literate, it is a matter of learning the program and applying their skills. Another student wrote, "I have researched and attempted to use portfolio assessment for several years. This is the first true application I have been assigned in which I believe the portfolio will actually reflect my performance and learning" (D. Hoffman personal communication, June, 1999).

Availability of Hardware and Hypermedia Software to Students

In order to create an electronic portfolio, students must have access to a computer and the software. Most universities have computer labs on campus which are available for student use at various times throughout the week. Many graduate students are also practicing teachers, and thus have access to computers within their schools, and computers are becoming an increasingly common item in home offices. A professor implementing the electronic portfolio as an assessment tool also has to ensure that students have access to the program(s) which are being used.

Every computer on the MSU campus has PowerPoint, and in addition to this, the computers housed in the College of Education's computer lab have HyperStudio. To enable students to work at home or at their place of employment, a multiple users license was purchased for HyperStudio. Students are provided with copies of these programs for the computers on which they will work while they are participants in the class.

Compatibility of Platforms and Word-Processing Programs

The computers and software programs students use must be compatible with the computers and programs to which the professor has access, and students are advised at the beginning of the course which word processing programs are available to the professor. Platform has not been an issue at MSU, since both Macintosh and Windows computers are available to both students and professors, but it may be a matter that others must consider.

Storing and Maintaining the Electronic Portfolio

Since current technology allows for the capture and storage of information in the form of text, graphics, sound, and video, students can save multimedia

presentations of their performance in one coherent document. However, a single floppy disk may not be adequate. One alternative is to use a zip disk that holds almost 100 MB of information. Jaz disks are bigger versions of zip disks which hold 1GB of information, the equivalent of 10 zip disks. Another alternative is a compact disk. A CD-ROM can store approximately 650 MB of information, or 300,000 sheets of typed text (Lankes, 1995). The type of storage devices that are available influence, to some extent, the multimedia portfolio.

Software

There are a number of commercial software programs available which specifically support the development and use of the electronic portfolio. The Grady Profile, Learner Profile, Chalkboard, HyperCard and LinkWay are a few of the programs on the market. Students can also create a portfolio in the form of a web page using programs such as FrontPage. My students use HyperStudio and Microsoft PowerPoint.

HyperStudio is a multimedia-authoring tool that allows an individual to easily and effectively communicate and deliver ideas on diskette, CD-ROM or over the Internet. All multimedia-authoring systems offer the ability to bring together text, sound, graphics, and video. HyperStudio provides access to data on the Internet and built-in image capture with AV Macs and/or digital cameras. It also allows the user to create and edit QuickTime and AVI movies (Wagner, 1997). In a portfolio using HyperStudio students create a stack that consists of a series of cards. By clicking on buttons installed on each card, one can navigate through the portfolio in either a linear or nonlinear fashion.

With PowerPoint, a student's portfolio consists of a series of slides. Features such as pre-designed slide layouts and backgrounds help students to quickly master and use this program. A click of the mouse on one of the buttons installed on a slide allows one to navigate the portfolio. Additional features, appropriate for presentations to audiences, include the ability to create black and white or color overheads, speaker's notes, outlines and handouts. Like HyperStudio, PowerPoint contains a graphics and sound library. Within this program, one has the ability to insert graphics or pictures from other files, including pictures from digital cameras, and connect to the Internet. Students also have the capability of linking individual slides to word processing programs installed on their computers. All of these features can be used in a PowerPoint based portfolio.

Figures 1 and 2 show a template for an electronic portfolio created using PowerPoint. Using this template, a portfolio can be viewed in a non-linear fashion, which means that the reader does not have to read the documents in the order in which they are presented within the table of contents. The documents to be included in the portfolio are determined by the professor, but students have the freedom to design the way they are presented.

Assessment of the Electronic Portfolio

As with any method of assessment, the professor must determine merit and assign a grade, and consideration should be given to how this is to be done. The criteria must include assessment of how well the technology was utilized, as well as the individual products contained within the portfolio. Professors are cautioned to not focus solely on the appearance of the portfolio; after all, the documents within the portfolio represent the substance of what students have learned in the course.

The criteria used to measure student achievement as demonstrated through the electronic portfolio can be evaluated using a rubric, the guidelines or the set of criteria used to describe levels of performance. Rubrics provide students with expectations about what will be assessed and standards that need to be met (Reynolds, 1998). There are two basic types of rubrics: holistic and analytic (Luft, 1997).

An analytic rubric breaks the portfolio into parts and rates each on a scale. A professor of education administration using the electronic portfolio and an analytic rubric to evaluate it would design a rubric with a specific set of criteria for each document and the student's proficiency in the use of the technology.

Students are either presented with the criteria in writing, or they may participate in their development. Each criterion would be evaluated with a letter grade or other rating that the professor and/or students choose. A grade for the entire portfolio would be determined based on the evaluation of each part.

A holistic rubric considers the whole portfolio without a detailed analysis of its parts. Ryan and Miyasaka (1995) describe the holistic rubric as, "overall judgment with no criteria" (p. 8). In this case, the criteria are usually contained within the professor's head, although sometimes the standards of performance are communicated verbally in advance. Feedback on student performance is provided in writing upon return of the portfolio.

Student Comments About the Electronic Portfolio

At the beginning of this project, the electronic portfolio as an assessment tool was new for all of us. The students in the first cohort of our educational leadership program to construct electronic portfolios for three consecutive semesters were asked at the end of their core of courses to reflect on how learning the technology and creating the portfolio helped them professionally and/or personally.

On the whole, the students considered that creating an electronic portfolio had been a very beneficial experience. Each felt that a valuable tool had been learned and that this tool would be useful in their future role as a school leader. A. Chaney (personal communication, May, 1999) said, "The knowledge provided me the tools by which I'm able to present information to teachers, students and parents in a more efficient and eye appealing way." S. Waller (personal communication, May, 1999) wrote, "I feel much more technologically literate after completing courses where programs like PowerPoint and HyperStudio were introduced."

Students readily saw the benefits of using technology in teaching and learning, and in communicating with the entire school community. K. Bell (personal communication, May, 1999) wrote, "The use of technology enhances communication to students, staff, parents and community by providing interactive and visual images which aid in teaching concepts or information which might be lost through a more traditional format." This student also felt that he modeled an effective practice that sparked an interest in teachers: "I have used both PowerPoint and HyperStudio to create slide shows for teacher staff development, mentor training, and student assessment. Teachers have been interested in learning to use the technology for their own presentations in the classrooms." Many students enjoyed developing an electronic portfolio: "Creating an electronic portfolio was one of the most creative assignments I have had and one I enjoyed immensely" (L. Merrill, personal communication, May, 1999).

Only one student expressed a desire for a more traditional form of assessment. This student felt that a test was more consistent with her personality and learning style. The only other negative view to be expressed concerned the amount of stress that some students felt when the requirement was initially presented. Overall, however, the experience of creating an electronic portfolio was a very positive one for all the students.

Conclusion

Every day in our global society, more technological advances are being made. The more sophisticated technology of tomorrow will enable interactive learning and authentic assessment to become a part of the foundation of every student's schooling (Palmer, 1995). Some day students from kindergarten through college will progress from one level to the next accompanied by a compact disk documenting their achievements. Mathies (1994) states, "as the lines separating computers, televisions and telephones blur, the information highway will offer all types of possibilities for education and entertainment" (p. 6). Today's and tomorrow's school leaders need to be competent in computer technology as they provide management and instructional support for their staff and students. Transforming paper portfolios into high-tech electronic portfolios as an assessment or career advancement tool is a step towards the future.

Note: Readers can find examples of student electronic portfolios at: http://www.coe.unt.edu/hudson/

References

Chambers, B. K. (1994). *Computer applications for school administrators.* Lancaster, PA: Technomic.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). *Interstate school leaders licensure consortium: Standards for school leaders.* Washington, DC: Author.

Cradler, J., & Bridgforth, E. (1999). Goals 2000: Educate America act: Technology in education reform, 1–3.

Evans, S.M. (1996). *Professional portfolios for school administrators.* Virginia Beach, VA: Teachers' Little Secrets.

Gresso, D. W., Burkett, C. W., & Smith, P. L. (1993). Time is not of the essence when planning for a quality education program: East Tennessee State University. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *Preparing tomorrow's school leaders: Alternative designs* (pp. 253). University Park, PA: UCEA, Inc.

Johns, J. (1992). How professionals view portfolio assessment. *Reading Research and Instruction, 32*(1), 1–10.

Land, M., & Coe, M.A. (1999). *Tools for schools: Appleworks/Clarisworks 5.0.* (1st ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Lankes, A. M. D. (1995). Electronic portfolios: A new idea in assessment. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Information and Technology,* 1–3.

Luft, J. (1997). Design your own rubric. *Science Scope, 20*(5), 25–28.

Mathies, B. K. (1994). *Technology in authentic assessment.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Murphy, J. F. (1990). Restructuring the technical core of preparation programs in educational administration. *UCEA Review* (Fall 1990), 4–5, 10–11.

Palmer, K. (1995). Interactive learning comes of age. *Momentum, 26*(4), 3.

Perry, J. (1999,). Way beyond word processing. *U.S.News Online.* Available: http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/beyond/grad/gbedtch.html [July 4, 1999].

Reynolds, S. (1998). *Rubrics.* Cooperative curriculum development, Monroe 2-Orleans BOCES. Available: http://www.monroe2boces.org/shared/instructportfolios/rubrics.htm [May 22, 1999].

Ryan, J. M., & Miyasaka, J. R. (1995). Current practices in testing and assessment: What is driving the changes? *NASSP, 79*(N573), 1–10.

Texas Education Agency (1996). *Long-range plan for technology–1996-2010.* Prepared by the Division of Instructional Technology. Available: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/ [July 4, 1999].

Wagner, R. W. (1997). *HyperStudio news and information.* Robert Wagner Publications. Available: http://www.hyperstudio.com [May 22, 1999].

Participatory Decision Making: Implications for Administrators

Michael D. Richardson
Georgia Southern University

Cathy S. Jording
Georgia Southern University

Kenneth E. Lane
California State University-San Bernardino

Jackson L. Flanigan
Clemson University

Dennis W. Van Berkum
North Dakota State University

Abstract

This paper examines the contemporary relationships between participatory decision making and established bureaucratic models of managing schools. The paper describes the attributes and components of participatory decision making as an alternative to orthodox management science. Participatory decision making is viewed as a possible approach that should be critically investigated by administrators who are attempting to make sustained changes in schools. Although no reform is the "only" answer, participatory decision making should be one of many tools used by a professional educational administrator.

Introduction

The rationale for participatory decision making as a process is based on the proposition that decisions should be made at the lowest possible level (Chapman, 1988). In K–12 education, this implies that the individual school, rather than a central system authority, should be the primary decision making unit (Bachus, 1991). Many districts attempting to implement participatory decision making are reacting to a perceived need to significantly change educational practice by creating conditions in schools that encourage improvement, innovation, and continuous professional growth (David, 1989). The trend towards greater reliance on participatory decision making, coupled with an increasingly diverse work force (Grenier & Hogler, 1991), has compelled many school districts to employ new techniques that are substantially different from the individualistic practices they utilized previously (Ilgen, 1986).

Educators practicing participatory decision making recognize that when the impetus and authority for school improvement comes from outside the school, it does not produce the responsibility and commitment necessary to sustain improvement (Mojkowski & Fleming, 1988). Research consistently indicates that top-down change has rarely been effective: "there will be no effective change in education unless employees at the work-site are involved in making change" (Reed, 1988, p. 2). Vogt and Murrell (1990) suggest that: "the fundamental goal of all educators is empowerment, helping people become capable of setting and reaching goals for individual and social ends" (p. 162).

Purposes

This paper examines the literature and research available on participatory decision making, including both the philosophical and theoretical foundations. Further, we explore the reasons why participatory decision making may improve instruction, and advocate its adoption as a viable alternative to the traditional bureaucracy which still exists in many public schools. We agree with Schmuck and Blumberg (1969), who concluded that: "Where efficiency depends on continued coordination and interaction of persons, a decision produced by the group to be involved will almost always be superior to one produced by even the most capable of individuals" (p. 89).

There are at least three philosophical foundations underlying the effectiveness of participatory decision making as a management process:

1) change should be student-centered, therefore decisions should be made as close to the student as possible (Lewis, 1989; Herman, 1989);
2) effective change requires the sense of ownership that comes with the opportunity to participate in defining change and the flexibility to adapt it to individual circumstances, therefore change is rarely the result of externally imposed practices (Conner & Lake, 1988); and
3) knowledge is power (Foucault, 1980), and effective decisions require good and timely information (Hall, 1991).

Background Policy Issues

Is it best for policy makers to simply direct the schools in their districts to begin participatory decision making, or should the initiative come from the educators themselves as they attempt to solve their problems at the point closest to the source? Sitting down at the policy table together to address the issues, either at the school or district level, is the only way all the participants will become true partners in the process and be comfortable with their individual and collective roles (Jackson, 1992). School administrators and teachers both have legitimate roles to play in the policy process. However, policy-makers and administrators cannot forget that the school board is a crucial link to the community, and must take that into consideration as they attempt to ensure that authority and responsibility are appropriately shared (Phillips, 1989). In the development of a participatory decision making policy, a critical component is the clear definition of the parameters of the decision making process at both the district and the building level. Before the school board implements participatory decision making at the school level, it should carefully study what the effects are likely to be on their existing policies (Guthrie, 1986).

Prior to implementing a shared decision making process at the building level, a policy must be developed to identify the appropriate participants and set the guidelines for participation (White & Epston, 1989). The board must define the roles which will be expected of administrators and teachers, as well as other staff members, in order to create a suitable environment for appropriate decision making. Establishing a procedure for addressing concerns prior to implementation eliminates many of the problems which could arise due to individuals attempting to negotiate positions in mid-process (Meadows, 1990).

Implementation

The largest obstacle to participatory decision making is determining how the process should be implemented (Lincoln, 1992). Once the participatory decision making mechanisms are in place, some of the participants may be uncomfortable with their changed roles. This phenomenon may be a result of a fear of "disturbing the way things are." People often become distressed when an existing structure, even one which does not function effectively, is altered (Fullan, 1991). For example, principals cannot simply say to faculty: "this is the process of teacher empowerment, take it, use it, you are now empowered." Such an action merely furthers the case for bureaucracy, not participation. The failure of some participatory decision making attempts can be directly attributed to the lack of proper training for those involved, preventing them from participating fully in the process (Bhasin, 1991). Administrators must spend the time and develop the expertise necessary to guarantee successful implementation.

Conceptual Development

Research dictates a systematic approach to the implementation of a new type of decision making process, which can be divided into three separate and distinct steps: conceptual development, role definition, and decision making. The first step is conceptual development, which involves the articulation of a common definition of what participatory decision making really means (Watkins, 1986). The terms "teacher empowerment," "site-based management," "participatory management," "decentralization," "shared decision making," and "school-based management" are all included under the general rubric of participatory decision

making. None, however, explains exactly what is meant by participatory decision making. What does it mean to the school board, the administration, the faculty, the community, and the staff of the individual school? Conceptual development implies that all those affected by this phenomenon must be given an opportunity to have some input into the meaning of the process. The definition must be acceptable to all those involved, particularly at the individual school. The definition which emerges from this process will have little meaning for a school fifty miles down the road, nor for someone in the state capital, nor for someone in North Carolina or California. Unless the interested groups reach a consensus on a common definition of what they are working towards, any attempt to implement the process would be premature.

Role Definition

The second step in this process is role definition. Smith and Peterson (1988) define role as: "a label for the set of expectations about an individual's behavior" (p. 73). Role definition means that in a participatory decision making school, roles must be altered. Teachers, faculty, staff, community and administration must all alter or modify the roles they have traditionally adopted and expected from each other. Faculty can no longer expect principals to make all the day-to-day operational decisions once they are empowered to make their own decisions about those things that affect them on a day-to-day basis.

Not only the faculty's expectations for the principal, but also the roles of all the participants must be changed, especially the faculty and administration's expectations for the students and the community, and their involvement in the school. Purkey and Smith (1983) indicate that: "a few studies find parental involvement and support to be a major factor in student achievement" (p. 444) and parents should be actively encouraged to become a part of the participatory decision making process. In participatory decision making, feelings of superiority must be abandoned and feelings of inferiority must be eliminated. Hodge and Anthony (1988) postulate that role provides the basic means for linking an individual with the larger organization, without losing either the individual or the system. Research makes it clear that the empowerment of site-level personnel, especially teachers, through access to decision making and the increased knowledge and status implied in the process, improves both morale and instruction (Maeroff, 1988a).

What do administrators, particularly principals and superintendents, stand to gain from this process? Principals are frequently the first line of resistance to site-based decision making, usually due to fear or ignorance (Kirkpatrick, 1985). Using participatory decision making, the principal acts as an executive officer who, by delegating authority, is able to direct instructional improvement and become involved to a much greater degree with important school functions (Gresso & Robertson, 1992). A principal who shares instructional leadership with teachers does not give up the responsibility for leadership, but is able to spend more time preparing schools to meet the challenges of the 21st century and, because of participatory decision making, is a more effective leader (Cunard, 1990). Most principals are not comfortable with change that is not clearly defined, and will admit they have not been trained to work with participatory decision making procedures. Preparing the principal to facilitate a participatory decision making team is no easy task (Maeroff, 1988b).

As the source of decision making changes, the roles of educators at all levels must undergo a similar change (Maeroff, 1988b). Supervisors are likely to have different functions in this new environment. The role of central office personnel will become, to a large extent, that of support and service to each of the sites in their district, particularly with regard to resources and information. However, central office personnel will not cease to be an integral part of the educational community, due to the need for good, timely information and the importance of some coordination of efforts between schools, although the possibility does exist that these positions "could disappear if school systems further decentralize responsibilities to school sites and decision making is flattened in the organizational pyramids of school districts" (Lewis, 1989, p. 100).

The Decision Making Process

The third step in the participatory decision making process is an examination of how decisions are made (Mojkowski & Bamburger, 1990). Decision making is a complex process with many complicated tasks involved, and, at its worst, appears to be purely arbitrary (Beach, 1997). If an organization is to make efficient, rational decisions, people and programs must be coordinated, communications must be appropriately channeled, and adequate resources must be obtained and utilized efficiently (Garcia, 1986).

In this segment of the process, administrators and teachers must examine how decisions are made in their schools and who is involved in making those decisions. Research indicates that one of the real weaknesses of participatory decision making in educational workplaces is the inability of teachers to understand how decisions are made (Moeller, 1964; Persing, 1989; Reep & Grier, 1992). Teachers make as many as 5,000 instructional decisions per day, but instructional decisions are different from administrative or management decisions, which often affect other people, particularly their colleagues. With participatory decision making, decisions are moved out of the classroom and into peer relationships. Teachers need training in how to process information, how to collect data, how to evaluate alternative courses of action, and then, ultimately, how to make a decision (Walberg & Lane, 1989).

Another problem teachers often confront in work groups is a lack of experience with debating issues and building consensus (Vann, 1992). Working on group dynamics and the art of compromise early in the transition period may be time well spent, and critical to the development of effective group decision making and consensus (Rummler, 1989). It is also helpful if teachers learn the essential relationship between autonomy and accountability. Making decisions can lead to conflict and mistakes, and even when the group finds a solution to a problem, often a new set of challenges appears.

This decision making process also leads to another important aspect: accountability. If teachers are to be involved in making decisions, then they must be held accountable for those decisions, just as administrators are held accountable (Hughes, 1993). If there is teacher involvement in decision making, they must be willing to take the responsibility for the decisions they make.

Do Teachers Want to Participate in Decision Making?

Principals often question whether teachers really want to be involved in making decisions. Teachers talk about empowerment and about making decisions, but do teachers really want to take the time, the effort, and the energy that is required for participatory decision making? According to Richardson and Long (1991):

> Can . . . teachers who are burned out or turned off be enlivened to become productive teachers again? Some of the best researchers say yes. They indicate that much of the "dry bones" effect is due to undesirable teaching climates, that many good teacher are simply suffocated by an unsympathetic system: good teaching goes unrewarded; poor teaching goes unnoticed or unpunished, and system survival is the functional philosophy of the school. (p. 22)

Empowering teachers is the key to a new life for American education. Frymier (1987) suggests that teachers are locked into a system that blunts teacher enthusiasm and stifles creativity, which he refers to as "neutering," saying: "neutered teachers lack physical strength and energy, enthusiasm for their work, and motivation" (1987, p. 12). However, the question of teacher involvement in decision making can only be answered at the school level.

There may be situations in which teachers do not feel comfortable participating in the process, and teachers should not be forced into participatory decision making regardless of their wishes (Kirkpatrick, 1985). Rather, the structure for participatory decision making "should be flexible enough to allow for varying rates of participation" (Newell, 1978, p. 140), and appropriate for the task (Blau & Scott, 1962). Some evidence

also suggests that for some teachers, having the "opportunity to participate" is more important than actually making the decisions (Hoffman & Maier, 1959). It should be noted that not all teachers wish to participate, yet are reluctant to become "second-class citizens" (Lewis, 1989, p. 88).

Do Principals Want to Share Decision Making?

Do principals really want teachers, students, and community members involved in decision making in their schools? Do principals really believe that participatory decision making will be beneficial to them, or do they see it as a threat to their power, their authority, their role, and their function in the school (Richardson & Long, 1991)? Traditional thinking implies that power is the ability to make someone do something they would not otherwise do (Dahl, 1963), while Filley, House, and Kerr (1976) defined power as the ability to have social influence over others. French and Raven (1959) examined power from five different perspectives, showing that people could exercise power in any of five different ways: reward, coercive, legitimate, referent or expert. Power is not something that can be arbitrarily taken, but it is something that must be given to the leader by the followers, and the followers must acquiesce to the power of the leader for there to be power involved. Do principals want to give up their power? Do they want to give up their perceived decision making power?

Participatory decision making does not imply that principals must surrender all control over their schools (Goldman, 1992). Participatory decision making is not a "power-over" but a "power-with" concept, meaning that the whole is greater than the sum of the parts. The principal and the faculty in a school can join forces to create an organization that is more powerful than either of the two groups alone could be. Participatory decision making reduces the "struggle for power" within an organization, because each faction must use its influence cooperatively for the organization to be successful (Cunningham & Gresso, 1993).

Conclusions and Implications

There are problems in restructuring educational systems to allow for the introduction of an effective system of participatory decision making. Training is necessary, and some current staff members will be unable or unwilling to adapt to the new management structure. However, the problems pale into insignificance when considered in relation to the possible benefits. The opportunities for stimulating the creation of new instructional programs and changing the way educational services are delivered are endless. As stated by Kanter (1983): "involving grass roots employees on participative teams with control over their own outcomes helps the organization to get and use more ideas to improve performance and increase future skills" (p. 241).

Participatory decisions, if arrived at fairly, can improve instruction by creating a sense of ownership in those responsible for teaching and learning. Teacher morale and performance, staffing and teaching flexibility, and teacher and student productivity will all be improved. As teachers have more opportunities to gain greater insights into the operation of their schools, they will gain status in the organization, winning more respect from both their colleagues and the community, and the decision making process itself will improve because of the increased flow of information and additional viewpoints. In addition, shared decisions may help teachers learn to share in other areas. The development of collaborative, colleagial relationships among faculty is an extra benefit derived from the experience of sharing responsibilities.

Administrators using participatory decision making should not be as concerned with "certainties" as with "possibilities." Goals are not "givens," but constraints within which the administrator functions. Administrators no longer need to decide whether to use participatory decision making or not, but how best to use groups effectively to make the most efficient decisions for the benefit of students.

References

Bachus, G. S. (1991). *The shifting format of administration in small schools: Participatory school decision making.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 339 571).

Beach, L. R. (1997). *The psychology of decision making.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bhasin, K. (1991). Participatory development demands participatory training. *Convergence, 24*(4), 5–15.

Blau, P., & Scott, R. (1962). *Formal organizations.* San Francisco: Chandler.

Chapman, J. D. (1988). Decentralization, devolution and the teacher; Participation by teachers in the decision making of schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 26*(1), 39–72.

Conner, P. E., & Lake, L. K. (1988). *Managing organizational change.* New York: Praeger.

Cunard, F. (1990). Sharing instructional leadership—A view to strengthening the principal's position. *NASSP Bulletin, 74*(525), 30–34.

Cunningham, W. G., & Gresso, D. W. (1993). *Cultural leadership.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Dahl, R. A. (1963). *Modern political analysis.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

David, J. L. (1989). Synthesis of research on school-based management. *Educational Leadership, 46*(8), 45–52.

Filley, A. C., House, R. J., & Kerr, S. (1976). *Managerial process and organizational behavior* (2nd Ed). Glenville, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings.* New York: Pantheon.

French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Frymier, J. (1987). Bureaucracy and the neutering of teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69*(1), 9–14.

Fullan, M.G. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Garcia, A. (1986). Consensus decision making promotes involvement, ownership, satisfaction. *NASSP Bulletin, 70*(493), 50–52.

Goldman, J. P. (1992). When participatory management attracts no buyers. *School Administrator, 49*(1), 15.

Gresso, D. W., & Robertson, M. B. (1992). The principal as process consultant: Catalyst for change. *NASSP Bulletin, 76*(540), 44–48.

Grenier, G., & Hogler, R. L. (1991). Labor law and managerial ideology: Employee participation as a social control system. *Work and Occupation: An International Sociological Journal, 18*(3), 313–333.

Guthrie, J.W. (1986). School-based management: The next needed education reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 68*(4), 305–309.

Hall, R. H. (1991). *Organizations: Structures, processes and outcomes* (5th Ed.) Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Herman, J. (1989). A decision making model: Site-based communications/governance committees. *NASSP Bulletin, 73*(521), 79–84.

Hodge, B. J., & Anthony, W. P. (1988). *Organization theory* (3rd Ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hoffman, L. R., & Maier, N. R. F. (1959). *The use of group decision to resolve a problem of fairness.* Ann Arbor, MI: Willow Run Laboratories, University of Michigan.

Hughes, L. W. (1993). School-based management, decentralization, and citizen control—A perspective. *Journal of School Leadership, 3*(1), 40–44.

Ilgen, D.R. (1986). Small groups in an individualistic world. In R. McGlynn & R. George (Eds.). *Interfaces in psychology: Organizational psychology and small group behavior* (pp. 149–169). Lubbock: Texas Tech University Press.

Jackson, S. E. (1992). Team composition in organizational settings: Issues in managing a increasingly diverse work force. In S. Worchel, W. Wood & J. A. Simpson (Eds.). *Group process and productivity* (pp. 138–173). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Kanter, R. M. (1983). *The change masters.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1985). *How to manage change effectively.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lewis, A. (1989). *Restructuring America's schools.* Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Lincoln, W. (1992). Shaping good decision makers. *Learning, 21*(1), 63–65.

Maeroff, G. I. (1988a). Teacher empowerment: A step toward professionalization. *NASSP Bulletin, 72*(511), 52–54, 56–60.

Maeroff, G. I. (1988b). A blueprint for empowering teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69*(7), 472–477.

Meadows, B. J. (1990). The rewards and risks of shared leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan, 71*(7), 545–548.

Mojkowski, C., & Bamburger, R. (1990). *Developing leaders for restructuring schools: New habits of mind and heart.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 330 078).

Mojkowski, C., & Fleming, D. (1988). *School site management: Concepts and approaches.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 307 660).

Moeller, G. H. (1964). Bureaucracy and teacher's sense of power. *The School Review, 72*(2), 137–157.

Newell, C. A. (1978). *Human behavior in educational administration.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Persing, T. E. (1989). Your staff must learn decision processes. *The School Administrator, 46*(3), 21–23.

Phillips, P. R. (1989). Shared decision making in an age of reform. *Update, 20*(3), 30–37.

Purkey, C. S., & Smith, M. S. (1983). Effective schools: A review. *Elementary School Journal, 83*(4), 430–444.

Reed, C. J. (1988). Site-based decision making: An implementation experience. *Collective Bargaining Quarterly, 1*(3),1–6.

Reep, B. B., & Grier, T. B. (1992). Teacher empowerment: Strategies for success. *NASSP Bulletin, 76*(546), 90–96.

Richardson, M. D., & Long, P. K. (1991). Restructuring school reform. *Clemson Kappan, 10*(1), 14–15.

Rummler, R. L. (1989). Turn to your teachers for curriculum improvement. *Executive Educator, 11*(4), 30–31, 37.

Schmuck, R., & Blumberg, A. (1969). Teacher participation in organizational decision. *NASSP Bulletin, 53*(339), 89–95.

Smith, P. B., & Peterson, M. F. (1988). *Leadership, organizations and culture.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Vann, A. S. (1992). Shared decision making= Effective leadership. *Principal, 72*(2), 30–31.

Vogt, J. F., & Murrell, K. L. (1990). *Empowerment in organizations: How to spark exceptional performance.* San Diego, CA: University Associates.

Walberg, H. J., & Lane, J. J. (1989). *Organizing for learning: Toward the 21st century.* Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Watkins, P. (1986). From managerialism to communication competence: Control and consensus in educational administration. *Journal of Educational Administration, 24*(1), 86–106.

White, M., & Epston, D. (1989). *Literate means to therapeutic ends.* Adelaide, Australia: Dulwich Centre Publications.

Linking New Research on the Emotions to Educational Leadership

James O. McDowelle
East Carolina University

Abstract

Practice and preparation in school leadership programs generally follow traditional views of behavior in school settings. However, new findings in neurobiological research on the role of the emotions in behavior and decision-making may cause this to change. This paper discusses the research findings as they relate to school leadership in the areas of persuasion, team building and one's overall approach to leadership. The article concludes with a call for radical reform in the preparation of school leaders.

Introduction: A Cautionary Tale

You are appointed to a leadership position in education. It may be as a principal in a public school or a department chair in a college or university. It is a position for which you are well prepared by training and experience. You understand the technical requirements for the job. You know the legal framework in which you must operate and budgetary constraints within which you must exist. Most importantly, you understand the instructional and curricular world in which your work is done. You are well versed in the knowledge base, informed about instructional methods, and know how to integrate technology into all administrative and pedagogical aspects of your leadership. You are ready!

You begin to work with your faculty, to mold them into a team and move them toward the changes need-ed in your organization, changes supported by the research and mandated by external constituencies. Now the trouble begins. Your colleagues are unfazed by your articulate, logical recitations of the latest re-search. Your team-building skills do not seem to work. Occasionally, despite your best efforts, your colleagues do things that are clearly not in their best interests and reflect badly on your leadership. For example, they have love affairs with people to whom they are not married. They take things from the work-site that do not belong to them, and they do not do their jobs. But worst of all, they are unresponsive to your rational, research-based persuasion and your attempt to promote teamwork.

You grow disillusioned with your colleagues. You become less collaborative, more directive, more rational, more research-based. You have to become more authoritarian. They just don't get it. You realize you are becoming depressed and the members of your organization seem to feed on your depression. Eventually, your colleagues, both superiors and subordinates, grow tired of you, and you either quit or get fired.

This unhappy scenario is repeated time and again in the field of school leadership. Current research in neurocognition, particularly the role of the emotions in decision-making, offers new insights into human behavior and basic human nature. Using this research to inform the preparation of school leaders could change the tale above to one of success and promise.

Researchers at the Center for Creative Leadership conducted studies of top American and European executives who failed in positions of leadership. They found that the most common reason for career derailment was the inability to build or lead a team (Leslie & Van Elson, 1996). Successful teamwork requires interpersonal skills based in emotional awareness and emotional sensitivity (Cooper & Sawaf, 1997). Goleman (1998) analyzed leadership competency models from organizations all over the world. His findings revealed that emotional competencies, rather than technical or cognitive ones, make up 80 to 100 percent of the skills and abilities listed by organizations as essential for success in leadership.

The purposes of this paper are: (a) to report research on the role of the emotions in neurocognition; and (b) to link this research to the practice and preparation of educational leaders. The areas of persuasion, team building, and one's overall approach to leadership will be emphasized.

Traditional and Emerging Views of the Emotions

The role of the emotions in neurological functioning has traditionally been viewed as separate and apart from the higher level processes of reason and rationality. The emotional nature of humans was believed to be a hindrance to rational thought and the cause of *all* irrational behaviors. Plato contended that the emotions made it impossible to think, and the Christian religion equated the effect of the emotions with temptation and the tendency to sin (LeDoux, 1996). Uncontrolled emotion can undoubtedly cause irrational behavior, but there is a growing body of scientific evidence which reveals that an absence of emotional feeling or an inappropriate understanding of emotional behavior can also cause irrational action and limit an individual's ability to make good decisions (Damasio, 1994; LeDoux, 1996; Pert, 1997; Pinker, 1997).

The emerging consensus among neurologists and cognitive scientists is that: (a) emotions are essential for rational thought; (b) emotion and reason work in harmony to produce sound decisions; and (c) emotion and reason cannot be viewed as separate entities in the cognitive process (Caine, 1999; Damasio, 1994; LeDoux, 1996; Pert, 1997; Pinker, 1997; Wilson, 1998).

For the purpose of this discussion, the emotions are defined as primary feelings, such as happiness, sadness, anger and fear, and secondary feelings, such as guilt, friendliness, and anxiety (LeDoux, 1996). Reason is defined as the process by which we work things out to solve problems (Caine, 1999). Examples of reasoning range from highly complex mathematical equations to making the decision to dine at home rather than in a restaurant. Caine (1999) suggested that reason solves problems, but the emotions select the problem to be solved. Emotions motivate us because feelings move us to action. "Reason lacks the capacity to motivate because it cannot make us feel anything. Its nature does not include any direct link to mental rewards, although it is, of course, always available to be applied to a task that entails a reward" (Caine, 1999, p. 27). Sylwester (1995) constructed a model of human behavior in which the emotions drive attention, attention drives memory, and memory drives learning. In a motivational model, one could say that emotions drive attention which in turn drives a linkage to prior emotional experiences and moves us to emotionally connected action. These assertions about the role of the emotions in human behavior can be demonstrated in the use of persuasion, an important act of leadership.

Emotion, Persuasion and Leadership

With the advent of site-based management and democratic decision-making in educational organizations, the skill of persuasion has become an extremely important leadership tool. Chernise (1998) reported research that described effective educational administrators as "unusually persuasive" and as having a "talent for persuasiveness" (p. 28). In an era when directive, authoritarian leadership is often not accepted, the educational leader's ability to persuade is a key emotional competency. Conger (1998) listed the four essential steps in the process of persuasion as: (1) establishing credibility; (2) identifying common ground; (3) using vivid language; and (4) **connecting emotionally** (emphasis added). Bennis and Beiderman (1997) stated that when a speaker appeals to the emotions, the speaker is perceived as not just articulate, but eloquent. The authors quoted political consultant James Carville's advice that "the head has never beaten the gut in a political argument yet, and I doubt it ever will" (p. 97). Although we work in educational environments, we often find ourselves in disputes that can be characterized as organizational politics, and when engaged in such political disagreements, Carville's advice can be helpful.

Gardner (1995) wrote that the actual world of leadership takes place in the minds of leaders and followers, and that good leaders create narratives or stories with

which followers can identify. These stories vary with the leadership environment, but they always tell the followers who they are, where they come from, and where they are going. These stories must "appeal at least as strongly to listeners' emotions as to their calculations" (Gardner, 1995, p. 48). Gardner's stories could be incorporated into any leader's overarching effort to persuade a group toward a strong vision of themselves and their work.

In the past, emotional appeals have been perceived as having less intellectual value than rational arguments (Bennis & Beiderman, 1997). If the conclusions reached as a result of the latest research on the role of the emotions in cognition are accepted, that belief will be modified. This is not to say we should abandon the use of reason and rationality in our attempts to persuade. However, it is important to be cognizant of the value of the emotions working in harmony with reason as we create narratives that assist us in leadership and team building. Acceptance of the emotional nature of humans is neither unethical nor anti-intellectual, but rather the reality of how the mind works. Consequently, collegial and collaborative leadership, because it involves working with human nature, must have emotions at its core.

Emotion, Teamwork and Leadership

Persuasiveness is a tool for team-building, and team-building itself is an essential ingredient of leadership. Williams and Sternberg (1988) found that a lack of emotional sensitivity and consideration hindered the cohesive development of teams. Limited emotional competencies in both leaders and team members disrupted the overall functioning of the team.

Cooper and Sawaf (1997) described efforts to promote positive interactions among executive team members by clarifying the executives' personal overload and dialogue interruption patterns. Specifying precise emotional vulnerabilities of individual team members as they engage in discussion and debate has been shown to promote group cohesion and improve group productivity (Cooper & Sawaf, 1997).

Leaders want team members to engage in open, rigorous debate. Often, intense debate leads to high quality decisions and problem solving. Conversely, debate of this nature also leads to emotional disagreements and possible harm to group unity and *esprit de corps*. Consequently, it is important for team members to possess the emotional competencies of empathy, self-awareness and flexibility in order to engage in passionate discussions of opposing views without losing group effectiveness (Goleman, 1998).

The emotional competencies required for successful teamwork are of special importance in educational organizations. The academic institutions that prepare many educational leaders frequently do not promote team building and collaboration (Goleman, 1998; Miller & Stayton, In press). In academia, a premium is placed on research, technical writing, and articulate presentation, skills which are often developed and practiced in isolation. Dr. Jerome Engel, a professor of neurology and director of a research center at UCLA, has been quoted as saying, "...I find myself fighting for reviewers to understand that collaboration is in itself a skill worth keeping someone for, it's essential to biomedical research. But academics from disciplines like math and history, where research is a solitary pursuit, don't understand" (in Goleman, 1998, p. 222).

Most higher education cultures would also reveal a lack of appreciation for collaboration in academic disciplines other than math and history (Miller & Stayton, in press). Despite less than supportive attitudes about teamwork in academia, team building skills are essential for leaders in the 21st century, and emotional competencies are the glue that binds a team together (Goleman, 1998). Bennis and Beiderman (1997) noted the necessity for team building in a period of complexity and advanced technology: "In a society as complex and technically sophisticated as ours, the most urgent projects require the coordinated contributions of many talented people" (p.2).

Emotion, Subjectivity and an Overall Approach to Educational Leadership

In order for the brain to avoid being overwhelmed by a deluge of perceptions, images, and other sensory

experiences, it must filter out some of these sensory experiences and focus on the input deemed essential for the moment. It is the job of the emotions to act as a filter and determine to which input the mind will attend. Input is sifted through past experiences and emotion-colored memory. Consequently, all sensory input is processed through subjective filters, providing us with a subjective perception of reality (Pert, 1997). While the existence or nonexistence of an objective reality will not be argued in this paper, evidence does exist to support the notion that our perceptions of reality are subjective and dependent upon our emotions (Pert, 1997; Pinker, 1997; Wilson, 1998).

The scientific fact that our subjective perceptions are hardwired in neurological processes should inform and regulate our overall approach to leadership. Leaders must consider the subjective nature of human perception when engaged in important leadership functions. For example, when evaluating other professionals for high stakes (e.g., money or job security), it is important to consider the subjectivity of the evaluator. Some businesses have dealt with the problem of evaluator bias by conducting "360 degree evaluation" (Endlich, 1999). This method of evaluation uses performance analysis from all segments of the organization. Superiors, subordinates and peers all provide input that must be considered in the performance appraisal. Businesses using 360 degree evaluation felt that acknowledging the subjective nature of evaluation, and instituting procedures to reduce bias, built trust in the evaluation process (Endlich, 1999).

Educational leadership researchers and theorists (Maxcy, 1991; Rost, 1991; Sergiovanni, 1992) have long called for collaborative, inclusive leadership practices that involve education communities in leadership. Neurological and cognitive research provides evidence that these practices are not only ethical, but also consonant with what we know about how the brain functions. Each of us lives in a subjective universe with perceptions filtered through an emotional prism. Therefore, it is important that educational leaders are aware that their view of the organization constitutes just one part of the total organizational picture. It is imperative that leaders are sensitive to the views and perspectives of other inhabitants of the organization. Fullan (1998) asserted that educational leaders must manage emotionally as well as rationally. He believed leaders should seek to bring about reculturing, as well as restructuring. Reculturing, because it is predicated upon the relationships of educators within the culture, will require the emotional competencies of sensitivity, effective inter-personal communication, and resilience. Successful reculturing will also require an acceptance of the subjective nature of human perception. Recognition of the human proclivity for bias should inform the leaders' overall approach to leadership as he attempts to reculture the organization as a collaborative, collegial community.

Integrating Emotional Competencies into Educational Leadership Preparation Programs

Acquisition of knowledge about the emotions, and the expansion of skills requiring emotional awareness and sensitivity should be an integral part of leadership development. The conceptual framework for the inclusion of this material would feature a progression that follows stages of: (a) an awareness of new research about how the mind works; (b) a more in-depth understanding of what this scholarship means for the study of human nature; (c) the practice of new skills and knowledge with support; and (d) the application of skills and knowledge to the creative exercise of school leadership (Bruner, 1960; Whitehead, 1929).

Awareness and understanding of new findings in behavioral neuroscience could be incorporated into existing courses on human motivation and behavior in which theorists such as Abraham Maslow (1954) and Frederick Herzberg (1966) are studied. The latest developments in brain research and the emotions can be seen as extensions of previous inquiries conducted by human behavior researchers and theorists.

Planned opportunities should be available for the application of skills requiring emotional awareness and sensitivity. For example, students should be encouraged to make advocacy presentations in which they are asked to abandon the scholar's objective posture and present arguments for programs and initiatives about which they have strong feelings. This

experience would require future leaders to, first, demonstrate their emotional commitment to some cause or idea, and, secondly, to gauge the emotional state of the audience as they attempt to adjust their argument to match the emotional fervor (or lack of fervor) of the people they are attempting to persuade (Conger, 1998). Gary Wills (1994), in an exposition about the importance of rhetorical skills in leadership, noted that great speakers such as Abraham Lincoln and Martin Luther King did not use logic to sway audiences. Instead, each employed "a repertoire of charged symbols for calling up the emotions of his audience" (p.224). Hoyle, English, and Steffy (1998) contended that "while evidence is important, persuasion involves human emotion. The facts alone never carry the day" (p.42). Advocacy presentations would help students see how a skillful blending of facts and emotion can persuade followers and move them to action.

Clinical experiences and internships present opportunities for the application of emotion-based skills in team-building. Observation of students engaged in team-building will furnish instructors and mentors with chances to see students interact with other team members and apply the emotional competencies of sensitivity, self-awareness, and flexibility.

Perhaps most importantly, knowledge about subjectivity and the limitations of human perception could be included in studies of ethical leadership and decision-making. An awareness of the neurological fact of subjectivity should engender in students a need to consider the views and opinions of their colleagues and constituents as they attempt to lead collaboratively. A discussion of the circumscribed nature of perception should support a consideration of the role of collaboration in ethical leadership.

Summary

Scientific investigations of the brain are changing our beliefs and assumptions about the role of the emotions in human behavior. A consensus is emerging among neurologists and cognitive scientists that the emotions work in harmony with reason to produce decisions. Educational leaders and those involved in the preparation of educational leaders must always be alert to new information about human nature and explanations about why people behave as they do. The fundamental concern of those in leadership positions must be people and how they interact within organizations.

Knowledge about the emotions and how they function in decision-making processes can help leaders as they attempt to facilitate the interactions of educators in schools. The role of the emotions in persuasion, team-building, and the leader's overall approach to leadership can provide a starting point in linking the emotions to educational leadership.

References

Bennis, W., & Beiderman, P. W. (1997). *Organizing genius.* Reading Ma.: Addison-Wesley Co.

Bruner, J. S. (1960). *The process of education.* Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.

Caine, D. B. (1999). *Within reason.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Chernise, C. (1998). Social and emotional learning for leaders. *Educational Leadership, 55*(7), 26–30.

Conger, J. (1998, May-June). The necessary art of persuasion. *Harvard Business Review, 76*(3), 84–95.

Cooper, R. K. & Sawaf, A. (1997). *Executive eq: Emotional intelligence in leadership and organizations.* New York: Grosset/Putnam.

Damasio, A. (1994). *Descartes' error: Emotion, reason and the brain.* New York: Avon Books.

Endlich, L. (1999). *Goldman Sachs.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Fullan, M. (1998). Leaders for the 21st century: Breaking the bonds of dependency. *Educational Leadership, 55*(7), 6–12.

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence.* New York: Bantam Books.

Gardner, H. (1995). *Leading minds.* New York: Basic Books.

Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man.* New York: World Publishing Co.

Hoyle, J. R., English, F. W., & Steffy, B. E. (1998). *Skills for successful 21st century school leaders: Standards for peak performers.* Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Leslie, J. B., & Van Elson, E. (1996). *A look at derailment today.* Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

LeDoux, J. (1996). *The emotional brain: The mysterious underpinnings of emotional life.* New York: Touchstone.

Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality.* New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Maxcy, S. J. (1991). *Educational leadership.* New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Miller, P. S., & Stayton, V. (in press). Higher education culture a fit or misfit with teacher education reform?: Faculty members describe their reality. *Journal of Teacher Education.*

Pert, C. B. (1997). *Molecules of emotion.* New York: Scribner.

Pinker, S. (1997). *How the mind works.* New York: W. W. Norton & Co.

Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership in the twenty-first century.* New York: Praeger.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement.* New York: Praeger.

Sylwester, R. (1995). *A celebration of neurons: An educators guide to the human brain.* Alexander, VA: ASCD.

Whitehead, A.N. (1929). *The aims of education and other essays.* New York: Macmillan

Williams, W. M. & Sternberg, R. J. (1988). Group intelligence: Why some groups are better than others. *Intelligence, 12*(3), 351–377.

Wills, G. (1994). *Certain trumpets: The nature of leadership.* New York: Simon & Shuster.

Wilson, E. O. (1998). *Consilience.* New York: Knopf.

Modeling Collaboration and Joint Leadership: Forging New Cultures of Inquiry

Carol A. Mullen
Auburn University

Abstract

Although colleges of education collaborate in some ways with university (and public) schools, new links need to be forged between the different professional groups and cultures. School and university professionals function as isolated bodies in the areas of shared research and joint authorship. This article suggests that institutions can build toward a more democratic future by becoming places of productive mentoring that benefit school participants as equal partners in research and publication. The author describes an approach she has used to create a model of shared leadership between schools and universities using a human relations approach to research and program development. The article explores the processes used in building collaborative relationships that enlarge the leadership capacities of individuals, groups, and organizations. This discussion concludes with suggestions for leadership programs in mentoring graduate students as educational leaders who will guide others.

Introduction

Schools and universities are experiencing changing paradigms that necessitate reforms, not only in educational structures and cultures, but also in relationships and roles within educational organizations and environments (Hargreaves, 1997; Mullen & Lick, 1999; Sarason, 1993). Goodlad (1988), Little (1990), and others have attempted to prepare future and present teacher educators for this cultural shift by encouraging the development of comprehensive school-university partnerships. In educational leadership, shifts in the role from manager to instructional to transformational leadership are exposing the need for a humanitarian, as opposed to an authoritarian, style of leadership (Oliva, 1997; Shoemaker, 1998). Moreover, critical approaches to issues of leadership support the importance of taking action that will eliminate oppression and promote equity through a focus on democratic relationships and social justice (Mullen & Patrick, in press; Ryan, 1998). As professors of educational leadership, we have a golden opportunity to redefine leadership as we engage in the preparation of those who will guide the development of future organizations.

The Context of the Times

Promising concepts of leadership are emerging during these times of educational reform that are collaborative and diffuse, humanitarian and empowering. University professors in educational leadership must not only teach about these concepts of collaboration and joint leadership, they must also model and cocreate them with students and research participants (Mullen, 1999a; Kochan & Sabo, 1995; Sibicky, 1996). Given the current climate of educational reform, school-university institutions would appear to be highly favorable places for developing new professional relationships and networks of inquiry (Norlander-Case, Reagan, Campbell, & Case, 1998). However, school and university practitioners have yet to create the scripts that are needed for their own democratic, equal relationships. Noteworthy examples of site-specific models have appeared in Johnston and Kirschner's (1996) special issue of *Theory Into Practice*, which focused on collaboration. Together, these stories of partnership support the vision and efforts of different professionals in crossing the traditional barriers erected by institutions in order to create cultures of inquiry and facilitate the creation of a just

society. Successful institutional collaboration has typically focused on the needs of universities in a variety of forms, including school research and teacher certification.

The standard procedure has been that researchers forward the mission of universities by treating schools as places for their own inquiry needs and program development. Consequently, they implicitly position themselves as data collectors in data-generating facilities that see the role of school practitioners as cooperative producers (for a fuller explanation, see Mullen in Mullen & Lick, 1999). A major problem with this approach is that university faculty only rarely engage in joint research endeavors with school faculty, and, when they do it is primarily the interests of researchers that are advanced.

How school participants position themselves relative to researchers regarding their own agendas and expectations is also a vital piece of this story (Lytle & Cochran-Smith, 1992). Schools and practitioners have been classically conditioned by the thoughts and actions of university researchers who have conducted inquiry "in very narrow ways, too often leaving out the voices and needs of those for whom the research results were intended" (Norlander-Case, et al., 1998, p. 2). Thus, even when school and university professionals do collaborate, the partnership is often challenged by cultural conflicts and political tensions that discourage individuals from working together effectively (Emihovich, 1992; Kochan, 1999).

Although colleges of education collaborate in some ways with university (and public) schools, new links need to be forged between the different professional groups and cultures. School and university professionals function as isolated bodies in the areas of shared research and joint authorship (Mullen, 1999a, 1999b, 2000). I suggest that institutions can build toward a more democratic future by becoming places of productive mentoring that benefit school participants as equal partners in research and publication. In this paper, I share an approach I have used to create a model of shared leadership between schools and universities using a human relations approach to research and program development. The article explores the processes used in building collaborative relationships that enlarge the leadership capacities of individuals, groups, and organizations. The crucial aspects that this article addresses as "inescapable elements in building learning organizations" are shared vision, team learning, and collegiality (Senge, 1990).

The description focuses on revealing areas in which collaboration was developed as part of a larger narrative about human and institutional transformation. My portrait includes the voices of participants to show how teachers, administrators, and professors can learn from conducting active research together in an effort to create egalitarian structures of research and organization as models for the future. This narrative is presented not to suggest the use of a single vision and model of collaboration, but rather to share a successful approach that has enabled educational professionals to recreate themselves and their educational systems. It is hoped that in sharing, others will create their own models and that important questions about the issues raised within this paper will lead to deeper discussions about the ways we operate, educate, and relate.

The Partnership Support Group

The Support Group Rationale and Composition

One approach to meeting the challenge of creating a reciprocal, egalitarian world among professionals from a variety of educational contexts is to allow a more collaborative relationship to develop that includes co-authorship of school-university research projects. This kind of innovation helps satisfy the need to create and sustain professional development experiences among different types of educators and leaders. Most partnerships of this type tend to focus on preservice teacher education (Darling-Hammond, 1994). However, some researchers, like myself, prefer to create support groups that connect universities and schools at a more personal level of commitment (Lieberman & Grolnick, 1997). The Partnership Support Group (PSG) is the name that I gave to this research effort. The PSG was convened as a mentoring team, with the primary purpose of promoting vital

connections between a research university and university laboratory school. In this section, I will discuss this collaborative inquiry network that I created as an illustration of how research relationships in school-university systems can occur on a deeper and more expansive level.

Teachers, professors, administrators, and other practicing professionals, as well as art students, at The Florida State University and The Florida State University School formally became a group in order to pursue an agenda of shared interest and benefit. The specific purpose of this network was to create a collaborative model and experience of joint authorship that would support a mutual topic of inquiry between the school and university faculty. I assumed the role of catalyst by creating the project and assisting this focus group of action researchers to attain benefits that would include everyone involved.

The 17 individuals who became members of the PSG were both beginning and experienced professionals and researchers. The PSG represented a continuum from novice to experienced professionals and writers. In the school, the continuum featured a newly hired teacher at one extreme and the current school director (and two former directors) at the other. In the university, the continuum featured a dissertation candidate at one end, and the former president of the University at the other, with junior- and senior-level professors in between. Collectively, our research and teaching specializations included leadership and professional development, mentoring theory and practice, organizational reform, curriculum design and programming, and preservice and inservice teacher education.

Partnership Support Group Processes

The PSG decided to conduct a collaborative action study that would support our research primarily within our own setting. The framework for our studies was the role of mentorship in helping to develop leaders as reflective, active researchers. The goals of the PSG supported the development of each member's professional identity, with an emphasis on team learning, writing/research and reading/analysis skills, joint project activities, and manuscript production. We agreed at the outset to aim for book publication as the product of our inquiry into varied forms of mentoring practice in our own teaching and learning contexts.

Most of the PSG members had experience as published authors, although the range of experience varied. Many had written at least one newsletter story or article and several had already published books. One teacher and an administrator joined with the explicit intention of seeking guidance for writing a book. The support group actively reached out to those who desired to publish, especially enthusiastic beginners. A primary goal of the PSG was to provide a guided opportunity for teachers to experience themselves as investigators and authors.

Project data were gathered through some of the strategies that I had used to develop the support group, which included mentoring logs that were shared, storytelling exchanges, and audiotaped meetings that were transcribed. Additionally, each group participant used data sources for his or her research development phase. Some data sources were used by the team as a whole, while others were used by individuals. Some writers conducted interviews and shared data to develop insights, while others opted for an informal approach, reflecting on conversations and observations. Some within our group devised a theoretical framework derived from the mentoring and change literature and from professional experience.

The group participants learned to integrate the theory and practice of mentoring. Generally speaking, at the outset of the project these university and school professionals had been grounded in either theory or practice, respectively, but neither group had had the opportunity to apply theories of mentoring to practice. The solution was to enroll both camps to serve as mentors for one another. Through this comentorship framework, everyone was actively guided in the effort to integrate educational theory and different forms of classroom, school, and university practice.

The Partnership Support Group produced a case analysis of many examples of mentoring experiences, programs, projects, and activities. These areas became

the basis for formal inquiry. Research results were published by a scholarly press as 17 single-authored and co-authored chapters on alternative approaches to mentoring (Mullen & Lick, 1999).

Benefits of the Support Group

A post-assessment conducted collaboratively by PSG members clarified areas that had facilitated and hindered our group process. Nine dimensions of facilitation were identified: *comentoring, openness, storytelling, leadership, active listening, fieldnotes, mutual support, appreciative understanding,* and *structured inquiry.* Four areas were viewed as having hindered the positive result produced: *uneven meeting attendance; conflicting responsibilities; varying degrees of commitment;* and *confusion between story and inquiry,* to which I added *the range in individual writing effort* and *extensive editorial work* (Mullen, 1998). Notably, members found it easier to generate the list of benefits. Even our final assessment of the group proved to be an example of a collaborative research activity.

The work of the Partnership Support Group did generate closer ties between the school and university professionals. Members described, both in their chapters and through correspondence, how the PSG has influenced their roles as collaborators, researchers, educators, and writers. They provided feedback to the effect that the structured inquiry, which involved biweekly meetings and professional readings and, above all, communication and synergy between the two worlds of school and university educators, changed their thoughts and actions.

A school administrator wrote in her chapter that "the greatest gift this group brought me was the time to reflect and write on my role as a school principal in a university climate which has shaped various mentoring connections in my own world." Teachers have expressed gratitude for "the support, help, and consistent mentoring" they received, as well as for "the special efforts made to ensure that the project would come to closure at the end of the school year rather than during the summer months." Significantly, the school practitioners have reported new professional writing projects with colleagues both within the school and at the university.

Coauthorship offers participants the opportunity to work differently and more expansively alongside researchers than traditional approaches to inquiry and collaboration. The PSG met its immediate goals; practitioners experienced heightened levels of professionalism and they got published. Members experienced such rewards as increases in productivity, dissemination of ideas, collaboration, and self-confidence. The contributions that their voices made to the project were invaluable.

Each member developed concepts and applications of mentoring in the workplace, proving that practitioners can conduct active research on critical topics that change their thoughts and actions, and that benefit themselves and others. In the PSG book, as in the support group itself, I was determined to enable participants to discuss their research and insight in their own voices.

The Complex Issue of Voice

These very positive gains did not come to us easily, and we learned to negotiate a fine line between our principles and the realities of the worlds of academe and publishing. As an author who had come to the PSG project having previously mentored novice writers using support group structures (e.g., Mullen, Cox, Boettcher, & Adoue, 1997), I anticipated that members would need direction and assistance in preparing their manuscripts for publication. However, I felt challenged by the extent to which I needed to rewrite and edit most of the chapters for scholarly publication. This effort raised complex issues for me about the purpose and role of personal voice in collaborative research endeavors like the PSG. The paradox of this situation made me wonder whose voice would be heard, and when and by whom. To gain perspective on my dilemma involving the reconstruction of participants' voices, I invited another member, who was also a published author, to play the role of assistant editor, which he did.

To further assist me in understanding the dilemmas involved in the creation of a personal voice in writing, I searched the educational literature for insight. Hargreaves (1996) offers the view that educational

researchers stereotype participants' voices as a generic voice that represents their own political positions. This is an astute critique of the research enterprise; however, other aspects of the fuller picture should not be overlooked. As in the case of the PSG book, the strong possibility exists that multiple personal voices may "survive" the editorial influence where individual chapters and perspectives are not reduced to data sets (e.g., quotes, exemplars, case studies) in the homogenized image of a single researcher.

Missing in the literature is the argument that participants influence and recreate researchers' voices as a living part of the inquiry process. For example, the PSG participants played a significant role in shaping my voice during the group process and in our writing. In the coauthored chapters, the participants identified my misconceptions about the local school and university context and changed them to reflect their knowledge and perceptions of reality. They also provided qualifying statements for my generalizations about how the university researchers had not engaged the school faculty in professional development and collaborative inquiry. Other support groups could provide new understandings of the issue of voice by studying this paradox.

Joint Research and Inquiry

Although our context shaped us, we in the Partnership Support Group also shaped our context in some fairly deliberate ways. For example, as the senior editor of the book, I saw it as my responsibility, as did the group, to write the publishing prospectus, a research-oriented, time-consuming activity. In my role as the group's facilitator, I negotiated and drew upon key concepts for the document that included an outline for the book that had been thoughtfully crafted during our meetings. This underlined the point that university researchers sometimes need to meet school practitioners more than half way in those challenging project endeavors where we have the writing/research skills and knowledge to facilitate certain desired goals.

Despite its challenges, the Partnership Support Group was nonetheless engaged in the concept and practice of joint research and inquiry. Typically, this area receives the lowest attention among the priorities of school-university collaborative efforts, including those of professional development schools. PDS's, which have been recently established as part of the Holmes Partnership agenda for major institutional change, are also challenged by this problem (see Darling-Hammond, 1994; Kochan, 1997; Lieberman & Grolnick, 1997).

Leaders must often critically examine their own belief systems; in my own case, I was "caught between caring and excellence" (Bolman & Deal, 1993, p. 53). For me, the issue of excellence revolved around our responsibility as a group to produce material of publishable quality that would be meaningful to educators in both universities and schools. However, the issue of building a caring community was even more vital to the project. Issues of fairness and equality were paramount, not only to the survival of the group, but also to its potential for promoting a new ethic for school participants as publishing researchers. To the PSG members, fairness and equality meant that they would be given the opportunity to publish on a topic related to mentoring, despite differences in status, skill, and experience.

The group focused on the publishing goals we had established as our beacon. Our work was not only published as a book called *New Directions in Mentoring: Creating a Culture of Synergy* (Mullen & Lick, 1999), but also as a special issue of *Theory Into Practice* (Mullen & Kealy, 2000) and as additional articles on related topics in other journals (e.g., Mullen, 1999a, 2000). The PSG satisfied its main purpose, which was to provide support for a guided research and writing project. Among the 17 chapters that members developed are these examples of self-selected active research topics:

- A reflection on a university mentoring program that supported junior faculty of color
- A description of mentoring in the career development of female faculty and administrators

- A narrative of an elementary principal's work in mentoring school and university educators
- An analysis of the artistic activity of students and how it promotes their relationship to the community
- An assessment of the public school's effort to restructure "organization" as a productive "family"

Negotiating a New Ethic of Partnership

University researchers are socialized to conceal rather than reveal issues of who, what, and where in their case studies. Participant anonymity is a tenet of training in higher education that leaves little room for researchers to negotiate alternatives. In Yin's (1994) otherwise comprehensive case study research, ethical issues involving participant voice and representation are *not* raised. The PSG was created in an attempt to answer the questions: "What are the aspirations of participants who support the research industry, serve the needs of university systems, and further the goals of researchers?" and "How can the same context that manages and assigns meaning to voices give rise to release and public expression?"

When such ideological questions frame the work of critically thinking activists, field studies shift; they become newly contested arenas for examining socialization processes and the needs of contributors. In some cases, anonymity (or degrees thereof, as in *this* essay) is the preferred mode of report, whereas in others, as in our book, it is more beneficial to participants to reveal their identities as coauthors.

The PSG explored the practical meaning of a new ethic of partnership. We strove to support joint inquiry and to dismantle barriers to goodwill. However, this idealism is fraught with unforeseen human complications. We experienced an unresolved tension around whether we would function as a collective entity or as a collection of synergistic individuals. For example, we attempted to distinguish between those contributions that warranted acknowledgment only and those that warranted coauthorship. However, ambiguity sometimes accompanied our decision-making processes; at such times, the PSG opted for generosity in attributing coauthorship.

The group concluded that a new ethic in education should include these principles:

- researchers and other educational leaders from privileged domains need to meet practitioners more than half-way;
- all constituencies need a clear understanding of the structures and institutional requirements that shape the lives of other constituencies; and
- the actual process of writing, responsibility, and the allocation of credit needs to be negotiated and renegotiated over time.

The crucial point is that the needs and values of all participants must be considered and discussed as the work process unfolds.

Relevance of the PSG Project to Higher Education

The value of the Partnership Support Group story that I have shared is that different professionals can come to a profound understanding of collaboration through guided activities that support writing and growth. The PSG members learned how to conduct research for personal/professional growth, for collegial and organizational development, and for dissemination purposes that included publication. This process of working together to develop democratic relationships between and among professionals in the school-university setting enabled members to build their leadership capacity toward a more empowering learning organization.

This approach to collaborative work, growth, and writing can be applied to leadership curricula for professors and graduate students in higher education contexts by addressing the following questions:

- How might professors in the area of leadership approach curricula and programming as effective tools for guiding the development of graduate students?

- How can educational leadership curricula and programs be improved to support the development of graduate students?

I suggest that graduate students need to be mentored to become competent educational researchers and published writers as a crucial part of the development of their professional identities and careers as educational leaders who will guide and lead others. This is a controversial position that I have adopted in response to these fundamental questions:

- What are graduate schools of education for?

- How might curriculum be effectively conceptualized?

- What should be included in the content of a contemporary curriculum in educational leadership?

- What orientations and skills should graduate students learn in order to develop facile and educated minds to effect social change?

- How can teaching faculty assist graduate students to prepare them to become the next generation of educational leaders and researchers?

The following three broad strategies can be adopted by other leadership professors, who also face a wide variety of students from different professional backgrounds with varying levels of skill, in their courses:

1. Develop a learner-centered curriculum that focuses on the professional growth of graduate students (who are often school practitioners) as writers and researchers. For example, I have developed the Writing Process and Feedback (WPF) model as a guided framework that engages the individual and the group in research focused on writing practice, feedback, and reinforcement of learning as a developmental process. A catalyst for the model is Dewey's (1938) philosophy that underscores how curricula needs to meet conditions of growth in order for it to be experienced as a form of ongoing learning for students.

I approach the WPF model by guiding graduate participants within a supportive group context to produce a manuscript on a topic that they strive to disseminate with my ongoing assistance. Students frame research problems, collect and analyze data, and share insights/findings; they choose preferred models of inquiry ranging from narrative to empirical frameworks. They also write and rewrite their manuscripts until a paper of publishable quality with the ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) Clearinghouse has been achieved. They devise concrete plans for continued forms of dissemination.

2. Build a network with a mentoring team spirit that has a common purpose of social justice and of a scholarly research community. One approach to meeting the challenge of creating a reciprocal, egalitarian world among professionals from a variety of educational contexts is to facilitate the development of a collaborative relationship that includes joint authorship of research projects. This kind of innovation helps to satisfy the need to create and sustain professional development experiences among different educators and all leaders.

The professor can provide the experience of shared authorship by preparing a book prospectus, based on the students' manuscripts, for the purpose of publishing a volume in which each student is identified as a contributing author. Alternatively, the effort can be one of producing a special issue for a journal in which each student manuscript is featured as a separate (or coauthored) article. Such innovations in mentoring provide students with contexts for continued professional growth that simultaneously model values of collaboration, productivity, and dissemination.

3. Adopt/negotiate strategies to develop the

individual and the group in the context of shared goals and vision. Professors can enhance the learning of students by mirroring the nitty-gritty processes of writing and research within the curriculum throughout each class. This kind of process exposes students to a viable framework, problem-solving opportunities, and a set of strategies that they can experiment with when carrying out their own research projects during and beyond the course. In my leadership courses, I have used, in a modified form, some of the techniques acquired during my work with the Partnership Support Group. Graduate students have joined me in producing research logs, performing writing tasks, generating and analyzing data, engaging in storytelling, reviewing notes and taped sessions, and assessing the overall effort.

My students have also identified the following strategies as important to their professional development: the structured writing process; incremental timelines of draft writing; technical formatting based on the APA formatting model; creative and metaphoric use of language and graphic symbols; conversations with peers and published researchers about their own writing queries and dilemmas; and the reading of student works that had already been prepared for publication. Above all, the students found that the experience of writing as an interdependent group process facilitated their knowledge, self-confidence, creativity, community-building, and, hence, their academic success.

Forging New Ground as Mentoring Leaders

The work of mentoring leaders in all educational settings must incorporate ethical considerations and progressive action at many levels (Lincoln, 1997). Not only should researchers think carefully about how participants' voices are being represented in the works they and others produce, they should also proactively consider these questions: "How can participants gain from contributing to research?" "Who is credited and rewarded for authorship in research texts?" and "How can collaborative research be used as an effective tool for understanding the experience of the researcher and how can it be applied to leadership curricula?" One overriding problem for researchers and participants interested in shared authorship and leadership practices is that educational institutions continue to favor participant anonymity. This research convention permits great latitude in the political exercise of "voice management" by researchers and institutions.

With this article, I have illustrated the strong need for educational leaders and all professionals to discover mutual interests and to mentor one another in a collaborative setting. We, as university professors of leadership, must be willing to forge new ground with schools and practitioners, just as we teach and expect our students to do. We need to discover new frames of reference and tools for modeling collaboration and joint leadership with diverse groups in "educational systems . . . that purposefully live and learn on the *creative* edge of chaos" (Fullan, 1999, p. 29). Whether or not a formal relationship exists between university professors and K–12 teachers and administrators, the idea of partnership is a laudable notion that needs to be pursued with passionate conviction as an avenue that can help prepare leaders for the challenges and possibilities inherent in creating and managing tomorrow's learning organizations.

References

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1993). *The path to school leadership: A portable mentor.* Sage: Corwin Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (Ed.). (1994). *Professional Development Schools: Schools for developing a profession.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education.* New York: Macmillan.

Emihovich, C. (1992). Teacher research: School/university collaboration from a new perspective. *Florida Journal of Educational Research, 32*(1), 7–15.

Fullan, M. (1999). *Change forces: The sequel.* London: Falmer Press.

Goodlad, J. I. (1988). School-university partnerships for educational renewal: Rationale and concepts. In K. A. Sirotnik & J. I. Goodlad (Eds.), *School-university partnerships in action: concepts, cases, and concerns* (pp. 3–31). New York: Teachers College Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1996). Revisiting voice. *Educational Researcher, 25*(1), 12–19.

Hargreaves, A. (1997). (Ed.). *Rethinking educational*

change with heart and mind, 1997 ASCD yearbook. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Johnston, M., & Kirschner, B. (Eds.). (1996). The challenges of school/ university collaboration [Special issue]. *Theory Into Practice, 35*(3).

Kochan, F. K, & Sabo, D. J. (1995). Transforming educational leadership programs through collaboration: Practicing what we preach, *Planning and Changing, 26*(3/4), 168–178.

Kochan, F. (1997, April). *Problems and benefits of professional development schools: teacher and teacher education.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Kochan, F.K. (1999). Professional Development Schools: A comprehensive view. In D. M. Byrd & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Research on Professional Development Schools: Teacher evaluation yearbook VII* (pp. 173–190). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Lieberman, A., & Grolnick, M. (1997). Networks, reform, and the professional development of teachers. In A. Hargreaves (Ed.), *Rethinking educational change with heart and mind* (pp. 192–215). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Little, J. W. (1990). The mentor phenomenon and the social organization of teaching. *Review of Research in Education, 16,* 297–351.

Lincoln, Y. S. (1997). Self, subject, audience, text: Living at the edge, writing in the margins. In W. G. Tierney & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Representation and the text: Re-framing the narrative voice* (pp. 37–55). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Lytle, S., & Cochran-Smith, M. (1992). Teacher research as a way of knowing. *Harvard Educational Review, 62*(4), 447–474.

Mullen, C. A., Cox, M. D., Boettcher, C. K., & Adoue, D. S. (Eds.). (1997). *Breaking the circle of one: Redefining mentorship in the lives and writings of educators.* New York: Peter Lang.

Mullen, C. A. (1998, Fall). Innovations in mentoring: Creating partnership links in a Florida school-university collaborative. *Florida Journal of Educational Research, 38*(1), 27–36.

Mullen, C. A. (1999a). Anonymity revisited: A case study in mentoring teachers-as-authors. *Teacher Development: An International Journal of Teachers' Professional Development.*

Mullen, C. A. (1999b). Birth of a book: A narrative study of a synergistic comentoring process. In C. A. Mullen & D. W. Lick (Eds.), *New directions in mentoring: Creating a culture of synergy* (pp. 48–70). London, England: Falmer Press.

Mullen, C. A. (2000, Winter). Constructing comentoring partnerships: Walkways we must travel. *Theory Into Practice, 39*(1).

Mullen, C. A., & Kealy, W. A. (Eds.). (2000, Winter). New visions of mentoring [Special issue]. *Theory Into Practice, 39*(1).

Mullen, C. A., & Lick, D. W. (Eds.). (1999). *New directions in mentoring: Creating a culture of synergy.* London: Falmer Press.

Mullen, C. A., & Patrick, R. L. (in press). "Hanging tough, being loving": A principal's reform of a school on academic alert. In S. L. Gupton & C. Funk (Eds.), *Women as school executives: The complete picture.* Texas Council of Women School Executives.

Norlander-Case, K. A., Reagan, T. G., Campbell, P., & Case, C. W. (1998). The role of collaborative inquiry and reflective practice in teacher preparation. *The Professional Educator, 21*(1), 1–16.

Oliva, P.F. (1997). *Developing the curriculum* (4th ed.). New York: Longman Press.

Ryan, J. (1998). Critical leadership for education in a postmodern world: emancipation, resistance and communal action. *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory & Practice, 1*(3), 257–278.

Sarason, S. B. (1993). *The case for change: Rethinking the preparation of educators.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization.* New York: Doubleday.

Shoemaker, C. C. J. (1998). *Leadership in continuing and distance education in higher education.* London: Allyn and Bacon.

Sibicky, M.E. (1996). Understanding destructive obedience: The Milgram experiments. In P. S. Temes (Ed.), *Teaching leadership: Essays in theory and practice* (pp. 105–126). New York: Peter Lang.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.